Lutheran Ecclesiastical Culture, 1550–1675

Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition

A series of handbooks and reference works on the intellectual and religious life of Europe, 500–1700

VOLUME 11

Lutheran Ecclesiastical Culture, 1550–1675

Edited by

Robert Kolb



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2008

Cover illustration: The Book of Concord of 1580: published with the permission of the rare book collection of Concordia Seminary, Saint Louis.

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Lutheran ecclesiastical culture, 1550–1675 / edited by Robert Kolb.
p. cm. — (Brill's companions to the Christian tradition ; v. 11)
Includes index.
ISBN 978-90-04-16641-7 (hardback : alk. paper) 1. Lutheran Church—History—16th century. 2. Lutheran Church—History—17th century. I. Kolb, Robert, 1941– II. Title. III. Series.

BX8018.L88 2008
284.109'031—dc 22

2008015940

ISSN 1871-6377
ISBN 978 90 04 16641 7

Copyright 2008 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.
Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Hotei Publishers, IDC Publishers, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers and VSP.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Brill has made all reasonable efforts to trace all rights holders to any copyrighted material used in this work. In cases where these efforts have not been successful the publisher welcomes communications from copyrights holders, so that the appropriate acknowledgements can be made in future editions, and to settle other permission matters.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA.
Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

CONTENTS

Abbreviations vii
List of Contributors ix

Introduction 1
Robert Kolb

The Culture of Conflict in the Controversies Leading to the Formula of Concord (1548–1580) 15
Irene Dingel

Academic Life and Teaching in Post-Reformation Lutheranism 65
Kenneth G. Appold

Preaching in Lutheran Pulpits in the Age of Confessionalization 117
Mary Jane Haemig and Robert Kolb

Instruction of the Christian Faith by Lutherans after Luther 159
Gerhard Bode

Devotional Life in Hymns, Liturgy, Music, and Prayer 205
Christopher Boyd Brown

The Pulpit and the Pew: Shaping Popular Piety in the Late Reformation 259
Robert Christman

The Social Impact of the Lutheran Reformation in Germany 305
Susan R. Boettcher

Church and State in Lutheran Lands, 1550–1675 361
Robert von Friedeburg

Nordic and Baltic Lutheranism 411
Eric Lund

Lutheranism in the Kingdom of Hungary 455
David P. Daniel

Comparative Table of Place Names 509

Names and Dates of the People in the Lutheran Story 511

Index 523

ABBREVIATIONS

ARG	*Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte/Archive for Reformation History*
BC	*The Book of Concord*, ed. Robert Kolb and Timothy J. Wengert (Minneapolis, 2000)
BSLK	*Die Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche* (Göttingen, 1930, 1991)
CH	*Church History*
CR	Philip Melanchthon. *Corpus Reformatorum. Opera quae supersunt omnia*, ed. C.G. Bretschneider and H.E. Bindseil (Halle and Braunschweig, 1834–1860)
HZ	*Historische Zeitschrift*
Ljb	*Lutherjahrbuch*
LQ	*Lutheran Quarterly*
LW	Martin Luther, *Luther's Works* (Saint Louis and Philadelphia, 1958–1986)
MBWR	*Melanchthons Briefwechsel, Register*, ed. Heinz Scheible (Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt, 1977–1995)
RGG	*Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, 4th ed., 8 vols., ed. Hans Dieter Betz et al. (Tübingen, 1998–2005)
SCJ	*The Sixteenth Century Journal*
TRE	*Theologische Realenzyklopädie*, ed. Gerhard Krause and Gerhard Müller (Berlin, 1977–2005)
WA	Martin Luther, *D. Martin Luthers Werke* (Weimar, 1883–1993) Br *Briefe* DB *Deutsche Bibel* TR *Tischreden*
ZKG	*Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

Kenneth G. Appold, James Hastings Nichols Associate Professor of Reformation History, Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, New Jersey, USA

Gerhard Bode, Assistant Professor of Historical Theology, Concordia Seminary, Saint Louis, Missouri, USA

Susan R. Boettcher, Assistant Professor of History and Religious Studies, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas, USA

Christopher Boyd Brown, Assistant Professor of Church History, Boston University School of Theology and Graduate School, Boston, Massachusetts, USA

Robert Christman, Assistant Professor of History, Luther College, Decorah, Iowa, USA

David P. Daniel, Chair of the Department of Church History and Professor, Evangelical Theological Faculty, Jan Comenius University, Bratislava, Slovakia

Irene Dingel, Director, Institute for European History, Mainz, Germany, and Professor of Church History and History of Dogma, Evangelical Theological Faculty, University of Mainz

Robert von Friedeburg, Professor of History, Erasmus University, Rotterdam, the Netherlands

Mary Jane Haemig, Associate Professor of Church History, Luther Seminary, Saint Paul, Minnesota, USA

Robert Kolb, Missions Professor of Systematic Theology, Concordia Seminary, Saint Louis, Missouri, USA

Eric Lund, Professor of Religion and Director of International and Off-Campus Studies, Saint Olaf College, Northfield, Minnesota, USA

INTRODUCTION

Robert Kolb

When reflecting on the past, historians and others have found it useful to label some eras "forgotten" and some "dark" (or an equivalent thereof). The latter definition comes into play particularly among those who wish to justify changes they are making in public life and thought by dismissing what has gone before. Just as the Middle Ages became "dark" in the writings of those who sought "Renaissance," so it served the interests of those involved in the movement called Pietism and among Enlightened thinkers to dub the period between the Reformation of Martin Luther and their own times an era of rigidity, unimaginative repristination, intellectual poverty and famine. Regarding the period as "dark" has resulted in its being to a large extent forgotten and neglected in serious historical research, resulting in a dearth of helpful studies of the period for much of the nineteenth and first half of the twentieth centuries. A few lines repeating the myth proved sufficient to excuse the lack of genuinely critical assessment of this era, usually characterized as "Lutheran Orthodoxy".

One of those who took this era seriously, Breslau and Rostock professor Hans Leube, observed in 1933, "If the era of historic Lutheran Orthodoxy is finally to attain the position due it in German protestant church history, there is still basic research to do".[1] More than half a century later Bochum professor Johannes Wallmann commented, "It would be wonderful if we got so far as to have gaps in the research on church history and the history of theology in the late sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries. For the time being a few edifices tower over a large field on which every once in a while something is erected. In between: no gaps, but rather no man's land".[2] Not long after Leube's

[1] Hans Leube, "Die altlutherische Orthodoxie. Ein Forschungsbericht," (1933), in Hans Leube, *Orthodoxie und Pietismus. Gesammelte Studien* (Bielefeld, 1975), p. 34 (pp. 19–35).

[2] Johannes Wallmann, "Lutherische Konfessionalisierung—ein Überblick," in *Die lutherische Konfessionalisierung in Deutschland, Wissenschaftliches Symposion des Vereins für Reformationsgeschichte*, ed. Hans-Christoph Rublack (Gütersloh, 1992), pp. 47–48 (pp. 33–53). Rublack, the editor of this volume, provided a masterful sketch of the state of the

premature death in 1947, Wallmann and a few other European and North American scholars began to expand research on the period between 1550 and 1750 with a more sober eye than most earlier scholars, and the past quarter century has witnessed a modest groundswell of studies on later sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Lutheran thought and practice.[3]

A key element in this surge of research and analysis has been the definition of the period covering part or all of the years between 1550 and 1675 as the "age of confessionalization". This research has roots in Tübingen historian Ernst Walter Zeeden's work on the roles which the "*Konfessionen*"—church bodies, Lutheran, Reformed, Roman Catholic, United—of Germany have played in German culture and society in general.[4] Under the pioneering leadership of Giessen and Berlin historian Heinz Schilling and Augsburg historian Wolfgang Reinhard, studies have moved beyond Zeeden's impulses to redefine the relationship between religion and culture in early modern Europe.[5] "Confessionalization" research has largely focused on the relationship between religion (expressed in Christian thinking at every social level and in the policies and practices of the institutional church, as well as popular and official ritual) and other organs and elements of society and culture. "Confessionalization" often refers more narrowly to the use (if not manipulation) of church and religion for purposes of the governing authorities for social discipline. That such was the case surprises no one since every social and political system in every culture chooses

---

research in 1988: "Zur Problemlage der Forschung zur lutherischen Orthodoxie in Deutschland," in ibid., pp. 13–32.

[3] For a survey of recent monographs on the seventeenth century, see the review essay, Robert Kolb, "Lutheran Theology in Seventeenth-Century Germany," *LQ* 20 (2006), 446–73.

[4] Ernst Walter Zeeden, *Die Entstehung der Konfessionen. Grundlagen und Formen der Konfessionsbildung im Zeitalter der Glaubenskämpfe* (Munich, 1964).

[5] See Thomas A. Brady, Jr., "Confessionalization—The Career of a Concept," in *Confessionalization in Europe, 1555–1700, Essays in Honor and Memory of Bodo Nischan*, eds. John M. Headley et al. (Aldershot, 2004), pp. 1–20, and Heinz Schilling, "Confessionalization: Historical and Scholarly Perspectives of a Comparative and Interdisciplinary Paradigm," in ibid., pp. 21–35. Three conferences sponsored by the Verein für Reformationsgeschichte between 1985 and 1993 provided impulses to further study; they produced: *Die lutherische Konfessionalisierung in Deutschland*; *Die reformierte Konfessionalisierung in Deutschland—Das Problem der "Zweiten Reformation,"* ed. Heinz Schilling (Gütersloh, 1986); *Die katholische Konfessionalisierung. Wissenschaftliches Symposion der Gesellschaft zur Herausgabe des Corpus Catholicorum und des Vereins für Reformationsgeschichte*, eds. Wolfgang Reinhard and Heinz Schilling (Gütersloh, 1995).

an ideology to help regulate society and explain reality in terms of the social and political needs of the culture.

Some studies, like the ground-breaking work of Schilling on Lutheran resistance to early-modern absolutist Calvinist rule in Lippe in the 1580s, have demonstrated that the common characteristics of the confessional groups loomed larger on some issues than specific contrasting theological positions. He demonstrated that commitment either to absolutist principles or to medieval principles of dispersed power in secular government were held by both Lutherans and Calvinists in whose interests it was to support one of these opposing political philosophies.[6] Such an observation conforms to Luther's assertion of the concept of civil righteousness and the rule of reason in the matters of this world. He contended that theological insights may guide general wisdom but the rationality common to all gives insights to Christians and non-Christians alike on what the best course of action is. For Luther believed that in what he called "the kingdom of the left hand," the world of daily life on earth, Christians, including his own followers, had no exclusive hold on rational discovery of what lies within the general human domain. He held that rational organization and governance of society was not necessarily tied to specific theological positions.[7] Despite this, Luther's new way of viewing God and humanity did create a new paradigm for understanding God's essence (as his mercy) and what it means to be human (in life-determining trust in the Creator and in performance of God's will in love toward the neighbor).[8] Because the key element in his definition is trust in God, it is difficult to measure its impact in modern social-scientific terms since trust, as important as it is to certain systems of psychology, defies social-scientific analysis. That their fundamental view of reality shapes human beings' actions is clear; how to sort out the conflicting factors in human motivation defies precise analysis, at least with current methods at hand. The essays in this volume point toward

[6] Heinz Schilling, *Konfessionskonflikt und Staatsbildung. Eine Fallstudie über das Verhältnis von religiösem und sozialem Wandel in der Frühneuzeit am Beispiel der Grafschaft Lippe* (Gütersloh, 1981).

[7] Cf. Gustaf Wingren, *Luther on Vocation*, trans. Carl C. Rasmussen (Philadelphia, 1957); Brian A. Gerrish, *Grace and Reason, a Study in the Theology of Martin Luther* (Oxford, 1962); W.D.J. Cargill Thompson, *The Political Thought of Martin Luther* (Sussex, 1984); James M. Estes, *Peace, Order and the Glory of God. Secular Authority and the Church in the thought of Luther and Melanchthon 1518–1559* (Leiden, 2005).

[8] Charles P. Arand and Robert Kolb, *The Genius of Luther's Thought. A Wittenberg Way of Thinking for the Contemporary Church* (Grand Rapids, 2008).

ways in which Luther's followers conceived of the interaction of God in the various forms of his means of acting, his Word, with sinners. The Lutheran view of human creatures also defined them as sinners who live in defiance of God. This view regarded believers as repentant sinners have come to faith in him but whose daily lives involve struggle with the remnants of that defiance. Further plumbing of the depths of Luther's view of reality, his students' absorption and modification of it, and the people's incorporation of it into their own way of thinking and in their own creation of their culture, is necessary.

In the broader discussion of the relationship between culture and church spurred by study of "confessionalization," the sub-culture of the church as an institution and the social relationships within its own distinctive cultural forms have too often fallen to the side. The origin of this designation for institutions lies in the theological practice of identifying positions on biblical positions for public purposes in documents labeled "confessions". Melanchthon's innovative use of that label at Augsburg in 1530 initiated a new way of dealing with secondary authority within the church but also grounded a new political definition of the church for German lands.[9] This volume hopes to aid those who wish to study how church life developed in the wake of the Reformation and how church leaders sought to cultivate the institutional activities and interactions of the congregations with their members as well as the governing structures that supervise congregational life within cultures where the Lutheran confession existed.

A culture is an organic entity composed of elements (especially human activities but also material factors, among others) and relationships which define the meaning and significance of life for a specific group of people linked by these elements in a common identity and in common endeavors. Within the culture of any society sub-cultures exist. Sometimes the sub-cultures' concerns dominate the thinking of individuals as they integrate themselves into the larger culture; sometimes the opposite is the case. In all such interaction influences move in both directions. In the lives of all people the claims of, for instance, the larger contemporary German culture compete with and amalgamate with the claims of political parties, labor unions, the firm for which a person works, as well as sports clubs, singing societies, and other distinct

[9] Robert Kolb, *Confessing the Faith, Reformers Define the Church, 1530–1580* (Saint Louis: Concordia, 1991).

groups to which individuals belong. In every culture in which it exists the Christian church functions as such a sub-culture. The churches of specific cultures have influenced and sometimes even transformed these larger cultures in specific ways, and at the same time the cultures in which the church exists have influenced and transformed the beliefs and practices of the church.[10] These essays reflect some common, core cultural characteristics and a broad field of diversity within the ecclesiastical cultures of Lutheran lands at various social levels during the period of Confessionalization.

Thomas Kaufmann defines "the Confessional"—what distinguishes "Confessionalization" as a period and historical development—as "a specific matrix for interpreting meaning, a world of symbols, a form of discourse; it defines membership [in the culture] and sets boundaries; it employs general understandable and recognized codes, pictures, or signs; it mediates specific values and models for orienting life, as well as fears and defensive strategies, forms of interaction and ways of dealing with suffering, of enduring and processing [negative] experiences".[11] This volume pursues the discussion of agencies within which that matrix functioned by assessing specific topical and geographical areas in which Lutheran thought asserted itself in shaping the ecclesiastical cultures and impacting the larger cultures in which Lutheran churches emerged. But precisely how the theology of the Wittenberg team functioned theologically to make its impact on the shape of Lutheran ecclesiastical culture and the practices that expressed and informed the piety of its people falls to a large extent outside the range of this volume. This topic very much deserves further study within the context of larger twenty-first century discussions of religion and culture.

Luther's understanding of God as Creator and this world as his creation laid the basis for the reformer's positive view of daily life and the gifts of God in culture. This is not always recognized because of a focus on his views of the pervasive nature of sin and evil in human life.[12] His doctrine of creation enables an embracing and grateful use

[10] See the work of Lamin Sanneh, *Translating the Message. The Missionary Impact on Culture* (Maryknoll, 1989).

[11] Thomas Kaufmann, *Konfession und Kultur. Lutherischer Protestantismus in der zweiten Hälfte des Reformationjahrhunderts* (Tübingen, 2006), p. 10. His volume surveys nine topics within the period but does not venture into definition or evaluation of this matrix and its theological or philosophical elements.

[12] In lecturing to his students on Genesis 32 in the 1540s Luther commented that God's sustaining Jacob as he went to meet Esau reveals that the whole course of nature

of every kind of cultural endowment as well as a Christian critique of all elements of culture that depart from God's will. His positive view of creation is also reflected in Luther's distinction of the vertical and horizontal realms of life and his often warm appraisal of the integrity of the created order, even when it has fallen into the hands of those outside the Christian faith who practice what he called civil righteousness. His view was not secularizing in the modern sense of banning God from interference with thinking and acting in this world, but it did affirm the natural goodness of family life, work and play, the arts, and all other aspects of human life on earth.[13]

The culture of a people or society in its broadest sense touches, shapes, and is shaped by every aspect of human interaction with the environment and with other human beings. The Christians in a culture do not differ in their cultural practices from others in many areas of life. In modern Western societies the church influences political and economic structures only indirectly, transportation, health care systems, sports and leisure activity, science and technology hardly if at all—even though these cultural factors loom large in the lives of Christians. Christians carry their values over into their use of and participation in these spheres of life, and they impact the church's practices and institutions in critical ways. But there are obviously no specifically Christian forms of football or surgery. Social structures often develop under Christian influence in part but largely independent of the church's input. Some festivals and rites of passage are closely linked to the church, others not at all. The church and many aspects of the media interact in a variety of ways, exchanging influences, as the arts in their various forms and the faith of Christians who practice them. What is true about these relationships in contemporary Western cultures, however, has not always been true. Therefore, the assessment of ecclesiastical sub-cultures differ according to place and time. Modern scholars must be able to cross cultural-historical boundaries to access their values, perspectives, and practices.

---

and human life reveals more good than evil and demonstrates that only "a very small part of life is subjected to the devil's power," WA 44:67, 9–10, LW 6:90.

[13] Cf. Johannes Schwanke, "Luther on Creation," in *Harvesting Martin Luther's Reflections on Theology, Ethics, and the Church*, ed. Timothy J. Wengert (Grand Rapids, 2003), pp. 78–98; Robert Kolb, "Niebuhr's 'Christ and Culture in Paradox' Revisited,'" *LQ* 10 (1996), 259–79.

Lutheran ecclesiastical culture was profoundly shaped by—but not completely dictated by—the core of the new perception of reality formulated and propagated by Luther, Melanchthon, and their colleagues in the Wittenberg circle. There has been a grand debate recently over the question whether Luther continues medieval themes in his own way or caused a "Copernican revolution" in the perception of what it means to be human and who God is. The answer, of course, lies in the simple observation that all human beings carry with them the gifts and burdens of their own past; a few grasp or fashion a new way of defining fundamental realities of human existence that affect the thinking of people over generations. The fact that Luther's writings have been translated into Chinese, Japanese, and Korean, as well as the Latin American languages of Spanish and Portuguese, in recent decades suggests that he belongs to this group, as do the many other ways he continues to haunt thinking in many parts of the world. His central interpretive insights[14] mixed with medieval views of the divine and the human. The essays in this volume only begin to explore to what extent the intangibles and immeasurables of personal belief—Luther's vertical dimension of life—interacted with and affected the performance or activity—Luther's horizontal dimension of life—in the first generation of his message and in the succeeding century in both the theological discussion and popular piety.

Because at the heart of Luther's way of thinking stood his belief that God's Word addresses human beings and acts as his instrument of giving new life, his call for reform and Johann Gutenberg's invention of printing with movable type made a perfect match, a marriage made in heaven. This can lead to an unbalanced reliance on printed works as an indication of how Lutheran ecclesiastical culture functioned. Indeed, as with all cultural studies, scholars are thrown upon their own imaginations to too large an extent because other sources for accessing the thinking of the general population are scarce and even harder to interpret. In searching for an alternative for studying great people because they are the elite, we historians are forced too often

[14] These included 1) his assertion that human life takes place in two dimensions, 2) his distinction of two kinds of righteousness, 3) his assertion in his "theology of the cross" that the essence of God is revealed in his mercy as exercised in the death of Christ, and 4) his conviction that God acts in his world through oral, written, and sacramental forms of his Word, as a Creator who wants to claim human creatures as conversation partners.

to skip over the common people, who leave behind few records, for the strange people, whose deviances leave traces in police blotters and minutes of heresy proceedings. However, an assessment of Lutheran faith and life in the early modern period from printed sources must be viewed for what it is, a specifically focused view based largely on the leadership of the culture. It is true that Lutherans produced a vernacular literature that provides "an especially sensitive 'seismograph' of the internal and external shock-waves and strategies of processing them by the intellectual leadership of Lutheranism".[15] But methods of assessing this printed literature for clues as to the cultural impact of the leadership remain in flux as scholars try to explore fairly and productively what was moving and driving cultural developments. Furthermore, popular belief and piety almost always take shape within a mix-and-match process of overlay and transformation that combines elements of religious tradition and new insights cultivated by a fresh message and/or new insights. This process of blending and conversion poses more complicated questions for researchers than the simple dilemma of whether people "became Lutheran" or remained "medieval" in their expression of their fundamental perception of reality.

For cultural appraisal requires a broad focus. These essays demonstrate that much in the Wittenberg program for changing various aspects of life depended on the fundamental estimation of reality that Lutherans drew from their reading of Scripture and their processing of the Western Christian traditional heritage. At the level of the intellectual elite the perception of reality conveyed to students by Luther, Melanchthon, and their colleagues did shape plans for re-forming church and society, but alongside the Wittenberg theologians many other thinkers and a host of other social and material factors molded the method and content of the next generations of theologians and other public leaders. On the lay or popular level what the Wittenberg theologians wrote and preached had no little influence on how many common people viewed the world, not least but not only through the printing press but through preaching and teaching.[16] Nonetheless, the heritage of medieval popular religion continued to frame and fashion significant elements of many people's thinking. Their material circum-

[15] Kaufmann, *Konfession*, p. 23. Kaufmann maintains that Lutherans produced more vernacular literature than did the other confessional groups.

[16] Mark U. Edwards, Jr., *Printing, Propaganda, and Martin Luther* (Berkeley, 1994), 37, 11.

stances also changed during this period, with striking effects in some areas and some decades, and the interaction of all these factors cries out for more study.

Much of the research dedicated to the church's life and culture produced in the 1950s–1970s on what was to become "the age of confessionalization" concentrated on the dogmatic theology of university professors, as had most of the earlier publications on the period. But ever more frequently in the past quarter century other elements of Lutheran ecclesiastical culture have won attention. Reflecting much of the research, the essays give readers a glimpse of the coherence of this sub-culture which spread across national and linguistic borders and several generations. It is a sub-culture with rich diversity but a center in a common view of God and humanity, fashioned in Wittenberg between 1517 and 1560 and then adapted to a variety of local circumstances over the subsequent century and a half. This volume does not ignore university theology and the controversial theology that set much of the agenda of more than official public doctrine for Lutherans between 1550 and 1675. Essays by Irene Dingel and Kenneth Appold rehearse aspects of the setting of other elements of church life in the struggle to define the Wittenberg heritage and the university instruction for pastors who conveyed that heritage officially. Dingel presents models of investigating the controversies among Luther's and Melanchthon's own students as they strove to define central elements of the Wittenberg understanding of reality in God's dealing with his human creatures. The questions upon which these controversies focused shaped much of the subsequent agenda and formulation of the thought and piety of Lutherans throughout subsequent centuries. Appold surveys how the results of those late-16th-century disputes were passed on to subsequent generations in the 17th century classrooms and how they extended and refined those results through creative theological endeavors.

Because Lutheran congregations centered their own activities no longer in ritual as the chief vehicle of religious expression but instead understood the church as the "mouth-house" (to use Luther's designation) in which God engages his people in conversation, activities of preaching and teaching and other forms of absorbing the biblical message command treatment in essays by Mary Jane Haemig and the editor, Gerhard Bode, and Christopher Brown. The impact of preaching and teaching on the piety of the people and how popular belief reshaped and resisted official teaching forms the agenda is treated by Robert Christman. Ecclesiastical life does not, it is clear, exist apart

from life in the larger society. Susan Boettcher surveys the interaction between Christians and their society in several components of social life. Robert von Friedeburg traces the complicated connections and tensions between the church and secular governments.

The final two essays approach the Lutheranism of the period 1550 to 1675 from another perspective, the geographical. The Lutheran Reformation was not simply a German event. Much note is made of the international aspects of Calvinism in the early modern period. Likewise, Lutheran churches played key roles in the cultures of the Nordic and Baltic lands, the kingdoms of Denmark (including Norway and Iceland) and Sweden (including Finland and parts of modern Estonia and Latvia), as well as in the three political subdivisions of the kingdom of Hungary, including today's Slovakia. Lutheran churches played vital roles in Estonian, Latvian, Slovakian, Hungarian cultural developments as they were also influencing German and Nordic societies in this period.

Both topical and geographical foci for the study of Lutheran ecclesiastical culture raise the question of periodization. Each scholar's own interpretation of who and what were important in the period provides a different agenda for dividing any larger stretch of time and labeling its parts. One problem is posed by the question, "when does the Reformation itself come to an end?" It is misleading and not a faithful reading of the sources to designate the events surrounding the Smalcald War and the Augsburg Interim as "the end of the Reformation". The theologians gathered in Magdeburg between the end of the Smalcald War and the Truce of Passau (1547–1552) did indeed think that the world was about to end and that the Wittenberg Reformation marked the key element in the "Last Days," but they believed that their efforts continued what Luther had begun and that precisely their on-going efforts to proclaim and defend his way of thinking were prolonging and carrying on the Reformation.[17] The long-used designation "early Orthodoxy" for the period following Luther's death tied it to the seventeenth century, probably due to a focus on the "epigone factor". I find more helpful the terminology of "Late Reformation," for until the Formula of Concord serious disagreement went on and could go on because his disciples in the churches of the Augsburg Confession were

[17] Cf. Thomas Kaufmann, *Das Ende der Reformation. Magdeburgs "Herrgotts Kanzelei" (1548–1551/2)* (Tübingen, 2003), esp. pp. 485–92.

still engaged in sorting out just how best to interpret and proclaim the Wittenberg message originally formulated in the 1520s and 1530s.[18]

What to call what follows the "Late Reformation" poses another problem. "Orthodoxy" is the usual term; like almost all theologians in the history of the Christian church, the Lutheran theologians of the years between 1580 and the early eighteenth century wanted to be "orthodox". Ernst Koch's insightful overview of "the confessional era," which he designates as 1563–1675, does not employ the expression.[19] However, the recently issued *Theologische Reakenzyklopädie* and the fourth edition of *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart* entitled articles with the term.[20] Study of "Orthodoxy" has tended to focus attention on university theology, particularly on the imposing tomes of the dogmatic masters. This has limited the understanding of the era, not only because it did bring with it the whiff of musty sterility and immobility (a false picture even of university theology in seventeenth century Lutheran circles) but also because it neglected the rich tradition of piety and preaching in the period. But no acceptable alternative term has arisen in the course of recent research.

Accepting that fact, the division of the period after 1580 remains unclear in recent scholarship. Markus Matthias and Johannes Wallmann define the years 1555–1600 "early Orthodoxy".[21] Olivier Fatio disagrees: "the beginnings of Lutheran orthodoxy can be traced back to the Formula of Concord" (1577)[22] I agree with Fatio and believe that the following thirty to fifty years mark a transition that can be dubbed "early Orthodoxy". Johann Gerhard (d. 1637), dogmatician and author of popular devotional works, serves as a kind of signpost for the beginning of "high Orthodoxy," an era that ended perhaps with the deaths of Wittenberg professors Abraham Calov (1686) and Johann Andreas Quenstedt (1688). Whether one concludes the Orthodox period with 1780, as Wallmann does, or 1740, as Matthias does, the intellectual

[18] Cf. Peter F. Barton, *Um Luthers Erbe, Studien und Texte zur Spätreformation, Tilemann Heshusius (1527–1559)* (Witten, 1972), pp. 7–10.

[19] Ernst Koch, *Das konfessionelle Zeitalter—Katholizismus, Luthertum, Calvinismus (1563–1675)* (Leipzig, 2000).

[20] Markus Matthias, "Orthodoxie, I. Lutherische Orthodoxie," *TRE* 25:464–85; Johannes Wallmann, "Orthodoxie, 1. Historisch, a) Lutherische Orthodoxie," *RGG* 6: 696–702.

[21] Matthias, "Orthodoxie," 25:465; Wallmann, "Orthodoxie," 6:698.

[22] Olivier Fatio, "Orthodoxy," *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Reformation*, ed. Hans J. Hillerbrand (New York/Oxford, 1996) 3:180.

strength and the power and influence of its thought among the people waned after 1675; by 1750 few theologians who can be designated "Orthodox" remained. Alongside these general considerations, it should be noted that individual territories and institutions may well be best interpreted with other period markers in place, such as Kenneth Appold sets for the University of Wittenberg.[23] This volume ends with 1675, the year of the death of the hymnist Paul Gerhardt, in part to demarcate it from the era of Pietism even though the two overlapped and interacted, positively as well as negatively, to a degree that has not always been sufficiently recognized.

These ten essays do not cover all possible topics that need to be considered in assessing the period. Ways of interpreting reality, such as the apocalyptic perspective explored by Volker Leppin,[24] would offer another approach to investigating Lutheran cultures. Exegesis and theology's interaction with other university disciplines as well as with other systems of thought, Christian and non-Christian, need much more analysis. The volume contains no study focused on ritual although work upon which such study can be based certainly exists.[25] The graphic arts and the non-religious literature produced by the poets, dramatists, and story-tellers of that day deserve a chapter of their own. Lutheran education beyond catechesis in the faith played a key role in society four hundred years ago and in discussions of Lutheranism of that period today; how it functioned still commands interest and significance.[26] Forms of polity and their development in different territorial or national churches also offer perspectives for assessing various cultural characteristics. Other regions could have also won treatment here. Even within Germany Swabian Lutheran piety took on a different texture already in the sixteenth century than had that of each of the (upper) Saxonies, Ernstine and Albertine, or the churches of the Lower Saxon circle. Comparative studies of Lutheran teaching and practice in

---

[23] Kenneth G. Appold, *Orthodoxie als Konsensbildung. Das theologische Disputationswesen an der Universität Wittenberg zwischen 1570 und 1710* (Tübingen, 2004), pp. 89–90.

[24] *Antichrist und Jüngster Tag. Das Profil apokalyptischer Flugschriftenpublizistik im deutschen Luthertum 1548–1618* (Gütersloh, 1999); see also Kaufmann's treatment of specific aspects of this phenomenon, *Konfession*, esp. pp. 21–25, 29–66, 230–36, 413–64.

[25] E.g., in the older study of Friedrich Kalb, *Die Lehre vom Kultus der Lutherischen Kirche zur Zeit der Orthodoxie* (Berlin, 1959) and the newer of Bodo Nischan, *Lutherans and Calvinists in the Age of Confessionalism* (Aldershot, 1999), and Susan C. Karant-Nunn, *The reformation of ritual. An interpretation of early modern Germany* (London, 1997).

[26] For background, see Robert Rosin, "Luther on Education," *LQ* 21 (2007), 197–210.

municipalities and rural areas as well as among the territorial churches could also reward intensive research.

Standards for assessing any historical age most profitably are difficult to formulate. Historians are compelled to pose and attempt to answer the questions of their contemporaries within their framework for evaluating life. Yet we learn most from the past when we listen to the concerns and presuppositions of the people of that age on their own terms. Much recent historiography of the Reformation and its impact has concentrated on appraising the "success" of Luther's proclamation, but largely on terms of changes in external behavior. This standard is culturally appropriate for late-twentieth century Westerners, living with a different sensitivity to the spiritual dimensions of early modern mentalities than the people of the era themselves had. External behavior is measurable from police blotters and preachers' complaints, and it is understandable to secularized moderns. Luther himself set a different standard for the "success" of his efforts: "It has, praise God, come to this, that men and women, young and old, know the catechism and how to believe, live, pray, suffer, and die,"[27] he commented in 1531, as he reflected on more than a decade of preaching and practicing reform. Both the criteria of his age and ours govern how we view what his successors achieved in their continuing development of his insights for the life of their churches and their members. Several essays in this volume turn also to questions relating to believing, praying, suffering, and dying—though these are admittedly impossible to measure in the same ways in which social behavior can be assessed.

Luther's and Melanchthon's successors are still sometimes dubbed "epigones," people of less distinction, imagination, creativity, and therefore influence than their Wittenberg mentors. In one sense it is true that relatively few people in human history can share the status of those two Wittenberg professors, whose profiles cast their rays over the intellectual and ecclesiastical landscape of much of Western culture into our own time. But in a more realistic sense the negative judgment implied in the term "epigone" blinds us to the fact that in each generation leaders of institutions, including the church, are called to preserve what is worthy from the past and to adapt it to new circumstances. That is

[27] "Aber nu ists/Gott lob/dahin komen/das man vnd weib/jung vnd alt/den Catechismum weis/Vnd wie man gleuben/leben/beten/leiden/vnd sterben sol…". *Warnung an seine lieben Deutschen*, 1531, WA 30,3:317, 32–34, LW 47:52.

not to say that every era is equally exciting or decisive in shaping the future. Epoch-shaping events of the magnitude of the developments in Wittenberg between 1517 and 1550 do not occur in every lifetime; not all individuals are equally gifted with intelligence or opportunities to exercise their intelligence. More interesting and useful to ordinary folk like us is the appraisal of any era for its methods and approaches to processing its heritage and adapting, altering, and applying within new circumstances.

That imaginative and creative leaders within the Lutheran churches did that throughout the period from 1550 to 1675 becomes clear in these essays, as does the fact that, like every era, the unimaginative and uncreative claimed their places, too. The authors of this volume intend with these essays to spur further discussion and analysis of an era that awaits both detailed micro-studies and larger interpretation.

THE CULTURE OF CONFLICT IN THE CONTROVERSIES LEADING TO THE FORMULA OF CONCORD (1548–1580)

Irene Dingel

As one of its chief concerns, research on the Reformation has posed the question of which modes and media were used to establish and develop the reformational inheritance. This research has appropriately found many foci, from the correspondence of humanistically-inclined municipal circles to the reformational sermon and hymn and the rise of publishing. In contrast, the decisive, crucial role of the controversies that systematized and synthesized the teaching of the Wittenberg theologians, conducted first in personal exchanges and then in print, has been largely neglected, these controversies dismissed as unnecessary squabbles among theologians. Only recently have researchers begun to study the bases for the public controversies, the topics they treated, and their results and impact, and to appreciate and take seriously this culture of controversy as the decisive motor for the refinement of reformational teaching, as the occasion for a process of composing a variety of confessional documents, and as a determining factor in the final consolidation of the confessional churches.

Of course, such struggles over proper expressions of faith and doctrine in academic and public disputes were nothing new. Development of a "culture of controversy" characterized the entire era of the Reformation, even if the second half of the sixteenth century, at least in the sphere of influence of the Wittenberg Reformation, cultivated this form of communication in a particular way. Indeed, this reflects historical developments in the political and educational as well as the theological realm. The term "Wittenberg Reformation" has been intentionally chosen to designate the pre-confessional phase of changes wrought in the faith, doctrine, and life of the church by both Martin Luther and Philip Melanchthon, and their colleagues as well. Only in looking at the controversies that broke out over the preservation of the reformational legacy in the second half of the 16th century does it become clear that it was not readily possible to hold the two great authorities of the Wittenberg Reformation, Luther and Melanchthon,

with their quite distinct theological developments, together. One group of their disciples were on the way to constructing a confessional position they designated as "Lutheran," while another—in reaction to the first—grew ever closer to Calvinism. A confessional variation between them which could be designated "Melanchthonian" or "Philippist" could not maintain its identity in the tensions of the age.

This essay lays out the general contours of a period that could command several volumes, narrating the story of the controversies that determined fundamental categories of Lutheran thinking and referring readers to recent literature on this era. Where the narrative depends on general recitals of these developments, references are not given, often pointing to the many challenges that still lie before researchers interested in the period.

The Rise of a Culture of Controversy in the Wittenberg Reformation

Solving problems and seeking truth by way of conversation, that is, through confrontation in the exchange of ideas, was an oft-used means of reaching understanding, with roots in the academic disputation of the medieval university. Academic circles often put the process employed in such disputations to use in both oral and published contexts. Luther chose it for his Ninety-five Theses against Indulgences, which he brought to public attention on October 31, 1517, in a literary form borrowed from the academic disputation. His theses challenged other intellectuals to a public exchange of opinions. They were sufficiently provocative to elicit clarity, as he intended, regarding the indulgence trade, which he found offensive theologically and contrary to canon law. This exchange of positive and negative opinions served as means for academics to use, according to specific rules and rhetorical patterns and techniques. It was new, however, in the 16th century, in the wake of the Reformation, for the disputations increasingly to leave the academic realm and make an impact in the public sphere, moving even into the vernacular. That did not end academic disputations, which also had, as a by-product, colloquies or religious dialogues that involved the non-academic public as well.[1]

[1] Irene Dingel, "Religionsgespräche, IV," TRE 28:654–81.

Moreover, the Reformation changed the rules or methods of conducting disputations. That can be seen clearly already in the Leipzig disputation between Luther and Eck in 1519. Luther used not only the scholastically prescribed rules of proof which decided the truth or falsehood of theological problems under consideration but also appealed to the authority of Holy Scripture, which his followers viewed as the highest norm and source of truth. It established truth and falsehood. This led to difficulties because the two sides did not give equal importance to this criterion, nor did they interpret it in the same way. This was a decisive reason why the great religious dialogs—which intended nothing else than to follow the pattern of the disputation and establish the truth on the basis of a controversy that took place according to the rules of disputation—failed. Even the inter-protestant religious dialogs, which the confessional groups favored by local princes carried out, such as the Colloquium at Maulbronn (1564) or at Montbeliard (1586), did not reach their goals. Nonetheless, they continued to be regarded as a medium of exchange, a means of reaching clarity and agreement. The countless disputations, dialogs, publications, and counter-publications, which the second half of the sixteenth century witnessed in the extensive controversies carried on in the controversial literature not only between Evangelical and Roman Catholics, but also within Protestantism, prove this. Debates and controversies were not conducted for their own sake or as a sideline in theological assessment of one's own position. They sought to show that opponents were wrong, to overcome their arguments, and if possible even to convince them, even if the course of the controversy was marked with sharp polemic. To classify such a culture of controversy, developed in a variety of contexts, as useless or to attribute to participants "intellectual pigheadedness and rigidity"[2] fails to recognize that neither side tried to formulate compromises, but both sides presumed they could claim that their interpretation represented religious truth. They were convinced that this would prove that their opponents erred, win the public, and convince the people of the legitimacy or scriptural faithfulness of their own point of view, if only they were skilled enough to express themselves properly and original enough to present it well. They believed that the truth vouchsafed by Holy Scripture affected historical reality. Therefore, many of the

[2] Kai Bremer, *Religionsstreitigkeiten: Volkssprachliche Kontroversen zwischen altgläubigen und evangelischen Theologen im 16. Jahrhundert* (Tübingen, 2005), p. 5.

authors of this controversial literature dedicated themselves to warning the public against their adversaries, unteachable and therefore as theologically dangerous as they seemed to be. This culture of controversy that developed after the Augsburg Interim (1548) made use of the widest range of literary genre: polemical publications and academic disputations, satirical songs and confessional statements, commentaries and sermons. These formed the way in which the heirs of Wittenberg codified the body of public teaching and provide the materials for study of this culture of controversy.

Presuppositions and Conditions for the Rise of Theological Controversies in the Second Half of the 16th Century

The controversies that flared in the second half of the sixteenth century within German Protestantism, which finally led to the Lutheran effort at achieving concord, dare not be interpreted only on the basis of their theological content, as important as it was for the construction of confessional positions in the early modern period and for theological orientation to the present. In addition, the reasons for the intensity of these debates and their duration—often over ten to fifteen years (they were not totally settled by the Formula and Book of Concord)—become clear only when one examines the complex conditions and contexts of their origins. Three factors must be named: 1. the historical-political framework, 2: the questioning and loss of the authority figures of the Reformation, 3: territorial rivalries and the search for theological identity.

The Historical-political Framework

The controversies conducted after 1548 over several issues erupted in the context of the severe crisis for German Protestantism triggered by the military defeat of the Smalcald League by Emperor Charles V in the Smalcald War (1546–1547). This league had been founded for the self-defense of the evangelical estates of the empire after the Diet of Augsburg (1530) against the threats of imperial coercion. These threats could be held in bounds because of the obligations of the emperor in other parts of his realm, a war with France that continued to flare, the defense of imperial borders against the advancing Turks. Armistices—the Nuremberg and the Frankfurt Truces (1532,

1539)—provided breathing room. By 1546 this situation had fundamentally changed, and the emperor had a free hand to conduct war successfully against the reformational "heresy". The decisive, shattering defeat of the Protestants took place on 24 April 1547, at Mühlberg on the Elbe. The two leaders of the Smalcald League, John Frederick the Elder, elector of Saxony, and Philip the Magnanimous, Landgrave of Hesse, were taken into captivity. Philip had to beg Charles for forgiveness, kneeling before the emperor, and was immediately placed into prison. John Frederick was taken before a military court, condemned to death for *lèse majesté* and heresy, but his sentence was commuted to life in prison. In the "Wittenberg Capitulation" (19 May 1547) he had to forfeit his electoral title, the electoral county (Wittenberg, Torgau, Eilenburg) and other territories, to his cousin, Duke Moritz, who had fought on the emperor's side against his fellow Evangelical princes.[3] With these two leaders of the Smalcald League imprisoned, and the southern German estates under imperial control, the war came to an end, apart from some resistance in the North, especially in Magdeburg. The emperor could return to his plans for reform in the empire and, particularly, for restoration of ecclesiastical unity.

To this end he called an imperial diet in Augsburg (September 1547), dubbed the "diet in armor" because Charles did not suspend the military occupation of the city and brought in additional armed Spanish troops. While his political reform plans had hardly a chance of success, he achieved more in the area of regulating religious questions at the level of the empire. He established a commission of theologians, which began working in January 1548, to establish imperial religious policy that would remain in force until a general council attained a definitive, overarching settlement. It included Julius Pflug, the Erasmian-minded bishop of Naumburg, auxiliary bishop Michael Helding of Mainz, and, on the evangelical side, the court preacher from Brandenburg, Johann Agricola. Later Domingo de Soto, the emperor's father-confessor, Pedro de Malvenda, imperial court preacher, and M. Saltzer, court theologian of Charles' brother, King Ferdinand, joined them. By March 15 they prepared an authoritative draft of the Interim. On 15 May 1548 the text of its preface was officially read to the imperial

[3] His opponents therefore labeled him "Judas from Meissen". Günther Wartenberg has corrected this image of the "traitor," in "Moritz von Sachsen," TRE 23: 302–311.

estates; it was clear that the document was not to apply to all imperial estates, as originally planned, but only to those who had "undertaken innovations".[4] It had become a law applying to the Protestants only. It decreed a return to the old faith and re-introduced many ceremonies and festivals abolished by the Reformation. Two important concessions to the Protestants were toleration of married priests and the chalice for the laity in areas where these practices had been introduced, until a general council made a definitive decision. For the ecclesiastically-governed lands Charles issued a "Formula for Reformation" (14 June 1548), with directives for reform of the clergy and monastic life; it was executed hesitantly, without great expenditure of energy.

It was not so easy to enforce the Interim, either. Electors Joachim II of Brandenburg and Friedrich II of the Palatinate declared their agreement, but many territories conducted tough negotiations, which often led to little success. Indeed, Charles had reversed reformational movements in areas in which Habsburg interests were strong before the Interim and reintroduced the old faith, but in general the Interim met opposition and sharp rejection. So-called Interimists encountered open enmity, expressed in abusive poems and songs, in pamphlets and illustrated tracts, that reviled the imperial Interim policy. Tough though passive resistance countered concrete attempts at introducing it. From captivity John Frederick refused to accept it, as did his sons, and the princes of Anhalt, the Margrave of Küstrin, the estates in Magdeburg and Halberstadt, the cities of Bremen, Hamburg, Lübeck, Lüneburg, Braunschweig, Hannover, Hildesheim, Göttingen, and Einbeck, where municipal councils and clergy stood together against the Interim. Magdeburg became for a while the center of the literary expression of opposition to it. A group assembled there around Wittenberg Hebrew professor Matthias Flacius Illyricus, which fired opposition through literary productions of all kinds.

More difficult was the situation in southern Germany, where Habsburg power was present to exercise pressure. Many imperial estates accepted a form of the Interim, without any consistent introduction of

[4] *Das Augsburger Interim von 1548, deutsch und lateinisch*, ed. Joachim Mehlhausen, (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1970), p. 34. See *Das Interim 1548/50. Herrschaftskrise und Glaubenskonflikt*, ed. Luise Schorn-Schütte (Gütersloh, 2005); Mehlhausen, "Der Streit um die Adiaphora," in *Bekenntnis und Einheit der Kirche. Studien zum Konkordienbuch*, ed. Martin Brecht and Reinhard Schwarz (Stuttgart, 1980), pp. 105–128; Horst Rabe, *Reichsbund und Interim. Die Verfassungs- und Religionspolitik Karls V. und der Reichstag von Augsburg 1547/1548*, (Cologne/Vienna, 1971).

its provisions. Seldom did princes succeed in blocking the introduction of the Interim completely, though Duke Wolfgang of the Palatinate-Zweibrücken, his theologians, and the population, banded together against the Interim and left its execution to the bishops, who could do little because they had no priests to send to parishes. Often cities dismissed preachers, or the preachers themselves chose exile, among them the reformer of Strasbourg Martin Bucer, Andreas Osiander of Nuremberg, Johannes Brenz of Schwäbisch-Hall, and Ambrosius Blarer of Constance. Nonetheless, feigned compliance succeeded in diminishing the impact of the Interim.

Occasionally governments crafted counter proposals or compromise programs, for example, in electoral Saxony, under the new Elector Moritz, who rebuffed the draft of the Interim which Joachim of Brandenburg and Friedrich of the Palatinate presented to him 16/17 March 1548. In conversation with King Ferdinand he had to concede that he would personally accept a unanimous resolution of the Diet which contained the Interim; he refused, however, to impose it upon his territories since he had guaranteed his subjects that they could retain their confession of the faith. Moritz expressed himself in a similar way, fortified by his theologians, to Charles (18 May 1548), although he should have introduced the Interim as the emperor's ally. Special negotiations conducted during the Diet in Augsburg led to nothing. Moritz sought a compromise; he sought a middle way between imperial demands and the objections of his territorial estates, which insisted on retaining their confession of faith, as Moritz had promised them they could do. Consultations went on into December 1548. Moritz had an alternative proposal forged, based on previous theological work prepared by Prince Georg of Anhalt, Melanchthon, and his Wittenberg colleagues, as well as Johannes Pfeffinger, superintendent in Leipzig.

This proposal was presented to the Saxon Diet in Leipzig in December 1548 as the Elector's substitute for the imperial edict.[5] This "Leipzig draft for the diet" (Proposal) contained an article on justification prepared in original form by Melanchthon. It contained evangelical positions on ecclesiastical offices and episcopal jurisdiction. It also introduced so-called "adiaphora," or "non-binding neutral practices,"

[5] Cf. Günter Wartenberg, "Das Augsburger Interim und die Leipziger Landtagsvorlage zum Interim," in *Politik und Bekenntnis. Die Reaktion auf das Interim von 1548*, eds. Irene Dingel and Günther Wartenberg (Leipzig, 2006), pp. 15–32.

several ceremonies and customs from pre-Reformation times, such as confirmation and extreme unction, the medieval outline of the mass, certain vestments, images, canonical prayers, and fasting. In contrast to the Augsburg Interim, this Leipzig "alternative" preserved evangelical doctrine but reflected some medieval Catholic practices in ceremony and custom. Although the Diet never gave this formulation official status, it provoked immediate concern and triggered most of the controversies that occurred within the Wittenberg circle after 1548.

Opponents of this attempt to preserve the chief concerns of the Reformation, including Flacius, designated the text contemptuously "the Leipzig Interim," after Flacius had the text published under this title. In March 1549 Georg von Anhalt produced an ecclesiastical ordinance (*Kirchenordnung*), for which Melanchthon had authored the doctrinal section. Though it won approval, it was not published. However, in July 1549 a summary of the Leipzig Proposal called "The Excerpt," or "the Small Leipzig Interim," was published and thus became official.[6] Moritz's government enforced it most hesitantly. "The Excerpt" permitted, among other things, images of Christ and the saints and vestments. It avoided topics that had elicited critique, namely justification, the ecclesiastical hierarchy, and episcopal jurisdiction and authority to ordain. Even this formulation combined evangelical teaching with Roman Catholic rites. Electoral Brandenburg took a similar route in this fashion. Nearly all evangelical clergy in these lands remained in office. Probably similar compromises were found in other territories, a matter that demands further research.

The Questioning and Loss of the Authority Figures of the Reformation

The process for reaching theological clarity set in motion by the imperial policy of recatholicization and the Interim, and, especially by the electoral Saxon alternative proposal, called into question the evangelical orientation toward the authority figures of the Reformation. Obviously, Scripture remained the authoritative norm and highest standard in questions of faith and teaching. The "*claritas scripturae*" was held to guarantee proper interpretation of Scripture. Nevertheless, hermeneutical approaches to Scripture and its interpretation produced differences, so that alongside the authority of Scripture other authorities were grasped

[6] CR 7:426–28.

to serve as interpretive authorities on a secondary level, as orientation for resolving debatable issues in the life and teaching of the church. Particularly the Wittenberg reformers, principally Luther, emerged as such "secondary" authorities. In his rediscovery of the gospel, it was said, God himself was at work. Contemporaries saw in him the third, eschatological, Elijah (after John the Baptist, the second Elijah). Philip Melanchthon, his friend and colleague in Wittenberg, contributed to this characterization of Luther.[7] The reformer was himself thoroughly conscious of his historic role. Early (around 1520) contemporary depictions, which show Luther's head in a halo and under the dove of the Holy Spirit, reflected this authoritative exaltation of his person. Alongside Luther's authority stood the entire Wittenberg theological faculty, among whom Melanchthon was most prominent. Political decision-makers—even kings and princes—turned to the faculty, especially to Melanchthon, for official opinions on theological disputes and for recommendations on ecclesiastical practice. Up to the mid-sixteenth century Luther and Melanchthon, with their colleagues, served as the authorities for advice and trustworthy interpretation of God's Word.

This changed in 1546–1548. Luther died 18 February 1546. The resulting vacuum of authority could initially be filled by the formidable influence of Melanchthon, which he had long exercised over his countless students throughout Europe, but the catastrophe of the Smalcald War altered that in 1547. The Augsburg Interim, which sent many evangelical clergymen into exile and reversed the Reformation in many places, and even more the fact that Melanchthon and the Wittenberg faculty participated in drafting the so-called "Leipzig Interim," the alternative proposal for electoral Saxony, with its compromises in ritual, discredited all of them. Many accused Melanchthon of abandoning fundamental reformational principles. Those who had served as guarantors of the Reformation were suddenly viewed by many as traitors of the evangelical cause. That Melanchthon had seen to it that the evangelical doctrine of justification—indeed, with his own typical accents—stood in the Leipzig Proposal and that this document did not become law of the land in any case, counted little in the disappointment over Melanchthon's and his colleagues' readiness to compro-

[7] Irene Dingel, "Ablehnung und Aneignung, Die Bewertung der Autorität Martin Luthers in den Auseinandersetzungen um die Konkordienformel," ZKG (1994), 38–43, esp. 41; Robert Kolb, *Martin Luther as Prophet, Teacher, and Hero. Images of the Reformer, 1520–1620* (Grand Rapids, Baker, 1999), 39–65.

mise. Especially Flacius, who had venerated his teacher Melanchthon, expressed this view. Flacius pilloried Melanchthon as the one responsible for supporting the fatal conciliation of Christ and Belial: he accused Melanchthon of combining correct with Satanic teaching and leading people into error.[8] His break with Melanchthon could not be healed. Melanchthon, on the other hand, suffered under what he regarded as lack of understanding of Flacius, whom he had once treasured greatly, and his comrades for what he had tried to accomplish. Flacius protested, "nothing is an adiaphoron when confession and offense to the faith are on the line,"[9] that is, when the clear confession of the truth is in danger, there can be no negotiation or compromise, not even with the ceremonies that Melanchthon regarded as adiaphora, neutral matters. Melanchthon and many of his Wittenberg colleagues were stamped—unjustly—as half-hearted, unreliable compromisers, who had recklessly abandoned Luther's teaching. On the other hand, the accused saw in their approach the only possibility for preserving evangelical congregations, their faith and teaching, and their structures of ecclesiastical governance in a time of deep crisis. This situation highlighted the need for indisputable standards or authorities that could orient biblical interpretation and evangelical teaching and confession in the future since the Leipzig Proposal sparked one part of the great controversies within Protestantism and placed Melanchthon himself between the fronts.[10]

Territorial Rivalries and the Search for Theological Identity

The defeat of the Smalcald League, the imprisonment of John Frederick, and his loss of the electoral title provoked a political, dynastic, crisis, which had decisive implications for the theological controversies within Protestantism. Since the division of the territories of the Wettin family,

---

[8] Irene Dingel, "Flacius als Schüler Luthers und Melanchthons," in *Vestigia pietatis, Studien zur Geschichte der Frömmigkeit in Thüringen und Sachsen. Festschrift für Ernst Koch*, ed. Gerhard Graf et al. (Leipzig, 2000), pp. 77–93.

[9] *QVOD HOC TEMPORE NVLla penitus mutatio in religione sit in gratiam impiorum facienda*, in Flacius, *Omnia Latina Scripta*… (s.l., s.d.), fol. C2b. See Oliver K. Olson, *Matthias Flacius and the Survival of Luther's Reform* (Wiesbaden, 2002), pp. 68–210; Hans-Christoph von Hase, *Die Gestalt der Kirche Luthers. Der casus confessionis im Kampf des Matthias Flacius gegen das Interim von 1548* (Göttingen, 1940).

[10] Irene Dingel, "Philip Melanchthon and the Establishment of Confessional Norms," LQ 20 (2006), 146–69.

16 August 1485, the "Ernestine" electorate and the "Albertine" dukedom had been rivals; the events of 1546–1547 intensified this rivalry. His tragic lot won him the aura of a martyr among some Protestants in the empire because he had to pay for his courageous defense of the true faith in the Smalcald War with the loss of his personal freedom and his electoral title to his Albertine cousin and antagonist, Moritz. John Frederick bore the title "the Magnanimous" and was regarded as a decisive champion of the true faith and a bearer of the cross, a disciple of Christ, who accepted his fate without complaint.[11] His release from prison in 1552, as a result of the Truce of Passau, changed nothing in this regard. When he died two years later, his three sons continued his policies and persevered in the faithfulness to their confession of faith inherited from their father, for example, in their cultivation of the political opposition to the Albertines, which the divisions over the confession of the faith increasingly reinforced. The Ernestine "young lords" advocated the pure, reformational teaching of Luther even at great political risk. Ernestine Saxony claimed a leading position in imperial politics as the homeland of the Reformation and the bulwark of the true evangelical faith, even if it had sacrificed its legal standing with the loss of the electoral title.

One of the most important aspects in this struggle for the faith and for political power was the question of a territorial university, a means of reinforcing the prestige of the ruling house, particularly in its rivalry with its cousins. The Albertine assumption of the electoral title meant that the Ernestine princes had to relinquish the territory in which the University of Wittenberg was located, which meant the loss of its cultural center. The despicable rival held the two most influential universities, Leipzig and Wittenberg, where Melanchthon's followers gathered after Luther's death. The Ernestine princes sought to compensate for the loss of Wittenberg by founding a new university in Jena and originally wanted Melanchthon to teach there. He decided not to abandon Wittenberg. Thus the new Ernestine university, opened in 1558, became an intellectual center for the so-called Gnesio-Lutherans, all those

[11] See songs in *Das deutsche Kirchenlied von der ältesten Zeit bis zu Anfang des XVII. Jahrhunderts*, ed. Philipp Wackernagel 3 (Leipzig, 1870), pp. 1009–13, 1016–29, 1062–64, 1261–66, 1270–72, and Robert Kolb, "The Legal Case for Martyrdom, Basilius Monner on Johann Friedrich the Elder and the Smalcald War," in *Reformation und Recht. Festgabe für Gottfried Seebaß zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Irene Dingel et al. (Gütersloh, 2002), pp. 145–60.

whose goal it was to preserve Luther's Reformation without falsification. Nikolaus von Amsdorf, Luther's friend, and Matthias Flacius Illyricus, his faithful student, led that group. The desire to appropriate Luther's thought for solving the current theological problems and a conscious identification with Luther's Reformation strengthened the conviction of these theologians that they must guard and protect his reformational legacy and promote the Ernestine policy of drawing boundaries between them and their Albertine rivals, particularly in the wake of the painful losses of the post-Interim period. They established unity in the faith, public teaching, and ceremonies in a visitation of their congregations (1554/1555).[12]

Another aspect of this policy was the editing of Luther's Works, undertaken in Jena in 1555 in competition with the collection of his writings begun in Wittenberg before Luther's death.[13] The Wittenberg Edition followed a topical method of arrangement to enable readers to survey quickly the reformer's opinions on specific theological questions; the Jena Edition presented his writings in simple chronological order. This served to prevent a false use of Luther as a reformational authority which ignored the historical development of his thought and its context. (The Gnesio-Lutherans believed that their opponents misused Luther's words, taking them out of proper context, to legitimize their positions, and reproached them for reckless abandonment of the heritage of the Reformation under the influence of Albertine policy while appealing to Luther at the same time.) The Ernestine theologians claimed to be the only true guarantors of Luther's unfalsified reformational teaching. The Ernestine dukedom, ruled by Johann Friedrich the Middler since 1554, was to remain the bulwark of the true gospel and the protector of reformational identity, despite the price it had to pay both politically and culturally.

This maxim governed Ernestine policy in the following decades even when the government entered into confrontation with its own theologians. In 1560/1561 and 1573 Gnesio-Lutherans had to go into exile for not agreeing with the court's measures in ecclesiastical affairs.

---

[12] *Geschichte der Universität Jena, 1548/58–1959*, ed. Max Steinmetz, (Jena, 1958), 1:36.

[13] Eike Wolgast, "Geschichte der Luther-Ausgaben vom 16. bis zum 19. Jahrhundert," in *WA* 60:431–60; idem, "Der Streit um die Werke Luthers im 16. Jahrhundert," ARG 59 (1968), 177–202; idem, "Die Wittenberger Luther-Ausgabe, Zur Überlieferungsgeschichte der Werke Luthers im 16. Jahrhundert," *Archiv für Geschichte des Buchwesens*, 11 (1970), 1–336.

They protested resolutely against this invasion of the secular arm into the church's life.[14]

This Ernestine policy of going it alone theologically and in ecclesiastical policy revealed itself in 1557 at the colloquy of Worms, where the delegation of Ernestine theologians, led by Viktorin Strigel but influenced by Flacius, demanded clear rejection of false teaching and false teachers within their own camp, making it impossible to form a united front of Evangelical theologians against the Roman Catholics. The Ernestine delegation's premature departure contributed to the collapse of the colloquy. It continued this approach at the Frankfurt diet of Evangelical princes in 1558, where the Lutheran princes pursued the long-standing goal of Christoph of Württemberg to achieve unity in confession among the Evangelical estates, a goal which formed the basis of the policy of consensus-building of the electors of the Palatinate, Brandenburg, and Saxony, along with the landgraves of Hesse. The Frankfurt Recess, formulated under the influence of a document Melanchthon composed, was to help overcome the disputes that had broken out since the Interim and bring the fronts together.[15] But Johann Friedrich the Middler joined with some north German cities (Hamburg, Lüneburg, Magdeburg), Mecklenburg, and Mansfeld to oppose what he regarded as a half-hearted attempt at unity. Instead, his government produced the *Weimar Book of Confutation*.[16] Flacius' circle composed this volume, which contributed greatly to the consolidation of a resolute, uncompromising Lutheran position as the confessional norm for his lands. The *Book of Confutation* became the central element of the *Corpus Doctrinae Thuringicum* of 1570, the new doctrinal standard for ducal Saxony. It served as a Gnesio-Lutheran counterpoint to the *Corpus Doctrinae Philipicum* (1560). This readiness to go it alone in defining the confession of the faith and the later efforts to regain the electoral title in the "Grumbach Affair" of 1565/1566 constitute part of the political and ecclesiastical context of the theological controversies between 1548 and 1577/1580. When Johann Wilhelm succeeded his brother, whom the "Grumbach Affair" landed in prison, in 1567, he tried to reach reconciliation in public teaching with his Albertine cousin

[14] Wilhelm Preger, *Matthias Flacius Illyricus*, 2 vols. (Erlangen, 1859–1861), 2:157–81.

[15] Irene Dingel, "Melanchthons Einigungsbemühungen zwischen den Fronten: der Frankfurter Rezeß," in *Philipp Melanchthon, Ein Wegbereiter für die Ökumene*, ed. Jörg Haustein (2. ed., Göttingen, 1997), pp. 121–43.

[16] See below, pp. 48–49.

August through the colloquy at Altenburg (1568/1569), but his Gnesio-Lutherans (the radical interpreters of Luther's legacy) and the Philippists (those who regarded Melanchthon's authority equal to Luther's and believed the two shared the same Wittenberg theology) could not come to agreement. A new approach was necessary; new persons had to assume leadership in the search for a formulation that could create concord among the interpretations of the Wittenberg legacy.

The Controversies

The controversies that broke out after the Augsburg Interim revolved around the question of how the reformational theology of Wittenberg should be conveyed to the following generations, either in conscious focus on Luther's teaching or in the form of a theology that integrated Luther and Melanchthon but stressed Melanchthon's concerns. Thus, the controversies were attempting to reach theological clarity within the framework of their authority and formulation of the Christian faith. They constitute a decisive part of the pursuit of confessional identity and at the same time an answer to the question of who might manage the Wittenberg legacy among the changing fronts in order to continue that tradition in its pure form. This led to the formation of groups around several specific constellations and thus to theological plurality within Protestantism. In this context it is clear that Luther's and Melanchthon's disciples created their own theological profiles. To characterize them as simply epigones of their great masters ignores historical and theological reality. The controversies following the Interim forced them to view their theological legacy anew and to refine their own accents.

Impulses in this direction occurred already early on, for example in the disputes with Johann Agricola on the role of the law in the Christian life (1527–1529, 1537–1540)[17] and in the tensions between Melanchthon and Amsdorf on the necessity of contrition for salvation, contingency and the freedom of the will, the bigamy of Philip of Hesse, the proper stance toward the papacy, and the precise definition

[17] Timothy J. Wengert, *Law and Gospel. Philip Melanchthon's Debate with Johann Agricola of Eisleben over Poenitentia* (Grand Rapids, 1997), pp. 77–175.

of the presence of Christ's body and blood in the Lord's Supper.[18] But the authority figures in Wittenberg always managed to address these problems. After Luther's death and Melanchthon's cooperation with Moritz's government on the Leipzig Proposal of 1548, that was no longer so easy. The battle for defining the Wittenberg heritage became intensely serious, a conflict over the fundamental identity of those who acclaimed Wittenberg reform.

It was not inevitable that this would lead to long-term and intensive disagreements. Even the Leipzig Proposal need not have launched such strife, for it was never officially adopted and made binding. What did arouse tempers was the fact that the entire theological faculty in Wittenberg—Philip Melanchthon, Johannes Bugenhagen the elder, Paul Eber, and Georg Major—, along with Leipzig superintendent Johann Pfeffinger, stood behind this proposal and even participated in its construction in one way or another. The strict Lutherans believed these leaders and friends had departed from Luther's teaching and placed the basic principles of the Reformation in question. They regarded the Leipzig Proposal's mitigation of the imperial Interim, though it did not depart from reformational teaching, as a betrayal of their cause since the introduction of the Interim in southern Germany had led to the exile of many pastors and their families. The courage of confessors such as Anton Corvinus only strengthened this impression. Corvinus, the reformer of Braunschweig-Calenberg-Göttingen, was imprisoned for three years because of his unyielding resistance to the Interim, and he died soon after his release as a result. This resentment was joined to the fear of a creeping perversion of Luther's teaching, fueled by zeal for preserving the reformational legacy in this situation of threat and persecution, the likes of which had not occurred in the previous three decades. All this may explain the uncompromising virulence of these controversies. A lasting solution could only be reached via a long path toward constructing a confession that took seriously the concerns of the warring groups.

The controversies that proceeded from the Leipzig Proposal, over adiaphora, good works, the use of the law in the Christian life, the freedom or bondage of the will, and the election of the faithful were not the only foci of dispute in this period. Andreas Osiander, reformer

[18] Robert Kolb, *Nikolaus von Amsdorf (1483–1565), Popular Polemics in the Preservation of Luther's Legacy* (Nieuwkoop, 1978), pp. 50–55.

in Nuremberg, in exile in Königsberg, sparked a fierce dispute over justification, in which almost all other Evangelical theologians opposed his views. The antagonism between Luther and Zwingli was renewed in a series of clashes over the Lord's Supper and Christology. Space does not allow even adequate summary treatment of all these controversies, so exemplary synopses of several are presented here to illustrate the course and nature of the controversies that determined in broad strokes the critical questions which Lutherans have used to define their confession, to a certain extent even into the twenty-first century.

Opposition to the Augsburg Interim—the Anti-Interim Polemical Publications

Scholarly analysis up to this point has largely presumed that the Augsburg Interim triggered all the controversies that arose thereafter. Likewise, scholars have often carelessly cast the controversies over the two "Interims" together. Both mistakes have frequently confused the issues of each dispute. The Leipzig Proposal sparked those later conflicts that required treatment in the Formula of Concord. Relatively few polemical publications were directly aimed at the Augsburg Interim; only these should be designated "anti-interimistic".

Melanchthon himself set the tone for the critique of the Augsburg Interim, though this was quickly forgotten or his position was falsely interpreted by his foes. For the *first* publication directed specifically against the Augsburg Interim was Melanchthon's *Judicium* or *Consideration of the Interim*, of 16 June 1548.[19] At the time of its composition, at Elector Moritz's request, Melanchthon had no *printed* version of the Interim in hand. Nonetheless, its official status was presumed. Unknown, however, at that point was the limitation of its application to the Evangelical estates, which appeared only in the preface of the text. This explains Melanchthon's caution on many articles, which he later abandoned. The *Judgment* stood as the position of the entire Wittenberg theological faculty.[20] This position was not regarded as secret but was distributed immediately in various copies. That led to its printing in Magdeburg,

---

[19] CR 6:924–42,, *Melanchthons Briefwechsel*, ed. Heinz Scheible (Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: fromann-holzbog, 1977–1995) [henceforth MBWR], #5182; cf. Heinz Scheible, "Melanchthons Brief an Carlowitz," ARG 57 (1966), 125–26.

[20] CR 6:925, 942; cf. *Augsburger Interim*, pp. 32–34, and Irene Dingel, "'Der rechten lehr zuwider'—Die Beurteilung des Interims in ausgewählten theologischen Reaktionen," in *Interim 1548/50*, pp. 292–311.

though without a location on the title page,[21] since the emperor had forbidden criticism of the document. The *Judgment* declared that the question of the Interim placed the confession of the truth at risk, that acceptance signified agreement that the Evangelicals had taught falsely to this point, and that it thus submitted to the suppression of revealed truth. He could concede that not everything that the Interim taught must be rejected but insisted that it rejected the heart of evangelical teaching, justification by grace alone. Therefore, Melanchthon implicitly called for passive resistance: "although war and destruction threaten, we should regard God's command as higher, that we not deny the clear truth of the gospel".[22] In addition to criticism of the Interim's doctrine of justification, he critiqued its doctrine of the sacrifice of the mass and the Canon of the mass. Melanchthon was more hesitant about the attempt to reintroduce medieval ecclesiastical structures. Already in the 1530s he had been prepared to accept them under the condition that they conform to the evangelical understanding of justification.[23] A few weeks later, as it became officially known that the Interim applied exclusively to the Evangelical estates, he sharply rejected those medieval structures, such as the jurisdictional powers of the bishops and their claim to be the sole interpreters of Scripture.[24] Melanchthon's *Judgment* pointed the way for all further theological consideration of the Augsburg Interim. Others in the Wittenberg circle agreed with his reaction to the articles at the heart of the Interim, on justification and the mass, while providing different accents in their critiques.

Nikolaus von Amsdorf's critique of the Interim of 1548[25] illustrates this. He attacked, among other things, the ecclesiastical structures that were to be reintroduced and, like Luther, identified the papacy with the Antichrist. Only God's Word had final authority in the church. The hierarchy under the pope defended by the Interimists opposed Scripture. The document would lead to the substitution of the reign of the Antichrist for Christ's rule. Johannes Aepinus composed the *Bekenntnis*

---

[21] See the editor's introduction, CR 6:924.

[22] CR 6:925–26.

[23] See Charles P. Arand, "The Apology as a Backdrop for the Interim of 1548," in *Politik und Bekenntnis*, pp. 211–27; Irene Dingel, "Melanchthon und Westeuropa," in *Philipp Melanchthon als Politiker zwischen Reich, Reichsständen und Konfessionsparteien*, ed. Günther Wartenberg and Matthias Zenter (Wittenberg, 1998), pp. 105–22.

[24] CR 7:12–45, esp. col. 25, #4286; MBWR 5:309–10, #5208.

[25] *Antwort/Glaub vnd Bekentnis auff das scho(e)ne vnd liebliche INTERIM* (Magdeburg, 1548), fol. D2b–E2b.

und Erklärung aufs Interim of the pastors of Hamburg, Lüneburg, and Lübeck. It echoed Amsdorf's polemical tone but hewed more closely to Melanchthon's content. It characterized the Interim, based as it was on papal tyranny, as an "Iterum" [repetition of medieval doctrine] to be avoided at all costs, for it reintroduced abuses, long-since abolished, which contradicted God's Word.[26]

Different opinions emerged regarding ceremonies. Melanchthon signaled a readiness to compromise on rites that were "neutral," neither opposed to nor commanded by God. His former student and strongest critic, Flacius, took the opposite position, positing a distinction between true and false adiaphora in cases where confession is necessary, based on whether they preserved or sacrificed Christian freedom. Ceremonies irresponsibly made binding by secular authorities—in this case the emperor—to solve the question of religion constituted an abuse of Christian freedom and could no longer be regarded as truly adiaphora.[27]

Many works against the Interim presented a historical-theological interpretation of the Protestant defeat in the Smalcald War and the Interim. Luther's understanding of history had already pointed to such events, placing them in the continuing battle between truth and falsehood, between God and the devil, within the context of the apocalyptic view of history characteristic of sixteenth-century thought.[28] Many were published in the refractory city of Magdeburg. Flacius' publications presumed that the Interim served as a model for interpreting the entire sixteenth century as the last times, in apocalyptic fashion.[29] In his eyes, throughout history, some had tried to make fateful compromises between true and false teaching, in his words, "combining Christ and Belial," reconciling Christ and Antichrist, which time and again led to a "Samaritan Interim" (2 Kings 17:24–41). For Flacius and his com-

---

[26] *Bekantniss vnd Erklerung auffs JNTERJM/durch der Erbarn Stedte/Lu(e)beck/Hamburg/Lu(e)neburg/etc. Supterintendenten/Pastorn vnd Predigern*… (Hamburg, 1548), fol. ♣2b.

[27] Preger, *Flacius*, 1:58–62.

[28] Cf. Caspar Aquila, *Eyn sehr hoch no(e)tige Ermanung an das kleine/blo(e)de verzagte Christen heufflein* (Erfurt, 1548), fols. C3a–b, D4b–E1a. Cf. Martin Schmidt, "Luthers Schau der Geschichte," Ljb 30 (1963), 17–69, esp. pp. 33–44; Martin Stupperich, "Das Augsburger Interim als apokalyptisches Geschehnis nach den Königsberger Schriften Andreas Osianders," ARG 64 (1973), 225–45; Peter Fraenkel, *Testimonia Patrum. The Function of the Patristic Argument in the Theology of Philip Melanchthon* (Geneva, 1961), pp. 59–61. 329–36.

[29] Thomas Kaufmann, *Das Ende der Reformation. Magdeburgs "Herrgotts Kanzlei" (1548–1551/2)* (Tübingen, 2003).

rades and followers, the term "Interim" developed into an embodiment of all alterations in the pure teaching and faithful confession of the Reformation that had to be rejected.[30]

That the Interim was experienced as the critical deciding-point for the truth and the touchstone for pure teaching and confession of faith in the proper reformational expression lay at the basis of all theological reactions and their thoroughly uncompromising rigor. The integration of these events into the longer historical and theological context characterized as a struggle between God and Satan formed the background for the undaunted confession of the faith and its concomitant preparedness for martyrdom which defined the true church.[31] This interpretation of the course of history and the experiences of the day informed the public positions against the Interim in the authors' published confessions and in the witness of their enduring persecution.

This posture was not limited to the so-called Gnesio-Lutherans, Flacius' followers. Melanchthon's *Judicium* also expressed his readiness to suffer for the truth. However, he did not want to burden believers in general and unnecessarily with suffering. He appealed to Elector Moritz to protect the church. An especially poignant expression of the relationship of confession and martyrdom among the reactions to the Augsburg Interim is the *Creutzbüchlein* of Erasmus Sarcerius. Melanchthon contributed its preface. As superintendent in Nassau, Sarcerius was forced into exile in 1548. Moritz gave him refuge; Sarcerius preached his prince's funeral sermon in 1553 although he later played a prominent role in Gnesio-Lutheran efforts to condemn false teaching. Pastoral in tone, the book gave a thorough argument, twenty-four "reasons" why confession and martyrdom, the gospel and the cross, accompany each other and must be born patiently. He repeated the conviction of the time, that avoiding the cross and persecution withheld honor from God and Scripture and obstructed the truth. Those who bear the cross give witness to the truth. Their persecution confirms the persecuted in their faith, teaching, and confession. Sarcerius regarded the devotees of the Interim as godless hypocrites, who did not recognize the cross and persecution for what they were, accommodating doctrine, sacraments,

---

[30] See Irene Dingel, "Flacius," and idem, "Strukturen der Lutherrezeption am Beispiel einer Lutherzitatensammlung von Joachim Westphal," in *Kommunikationsstrukturen im europäischen Lutherum der Frühen Neuzeit*, ed. Wolfgang Sommer (Gütersloh, 2005), pp. 32–50.

[31] *Vom Wintervogel Halcyon/ein herlich wunderwerck Gottis*… (Hamburg, 1552).

and worship of God to human reason and wisdom, in order to gain the world's recognition and live without trouble.[32] Sarcerius encouraged readers to persevere in their resistance and confession. Nevertheless, he appealed to secular authorities to make every effort to create a peaceful situation for all confessors of the faith. Over time this readiness to make confession of the faith and suffer for it became characteristic of the Gnesio-Lutherans and the Flacians, who often endured exile because they rejected unwarranted governmental intervention into ecclesiastical affairs.

The Adiaphoristic Controversy

Other territories and towns engaged in an uncompromising *passive* resistance to the Interim, but Magdeburg, dubbed "our Lord God's chancellery," became the center of *active* resistance. Luther's disciples from north Germany—Amsdorf, Johannes Wigand, Matthaeus Judex, Nikolaus Gallus, and others, with Flacius their leading thinker—assembled there. They began a lively propaganda campaign against the Interim and Moritz's policy of compromise with the emperor, with so-called adiaphora at the heart of their argument. They referred specifically to the medieval rites and vestments prescribed in the Augsburg Interim and in the electoral Saxon "Excerpt". These issues became particularly explosive because these "free, neutral, matters" carried with them implicit rejection of the teaching of justification and other elements of evangelical doctrine. In this exchange Melanchthon and Flacius led the two sides.

Presuppositions

The question of adiaphora was not new. It touched an area that had divided the medieval church and the Reformation: the worth and significance of ceremonies and prescriptions for life rooted in a ritual understanding of worship and devotion. Essential to reformational teaching was the rejection of all works-righteousness and every good work that used ritual or ceremonies to attain justification. The question regarding adiaphora covered a border area between what is necessary

[32] *Creutzbu(e)chlein. Darinnen vier vnd zwentzig Vrsachen vermeldet werden/Warumb die reyne lehr des Euangelij/trewe Prediger/vnnd frum(m)e Christen/ohne Creutz vnnd Leiden/nit sein mo(e)gen*… (Leipzig, 1550), fols. C2b, N4b–N5a.

for faith, justification, and salvation and what be might detrimental or even fatal for faith and salvation. Article 26 of the Augsburg Confession discussed ecclesiastical regulations, condemning trust in such works for salvation. Luther harbored a deep aversion toward concessions in alleged adiaphora but argued for sparing the consciences of the weak by retaining some medieval practices that did not directly contradict his teaching. That remained Melanchthon's fundamental position; in the wake of the Smalcald War he signaled his willingness to compromise when the cultic actions being considered were truly only externals. This relatively small difference between the two sides loomed large, however, in this historical context, with the compromising position of the Leipzig Proposal. The controversy continued to feed on itself even after all reason for its continuation disappeared with the Religious Peace of Augsburg (1555).

Course of the controversy

It became known as the Saxon theologians met in Meissen in early July 1548 that the Augsburg Interim applied only to the Evangelicals. The Wittenberg theologians unanimously repeated their rejection of the imperial religious law. Melanchthon, Georg Major, Caspar Cruciger, along with other Saxon churchmen, Johann Pfeffinger, Daniel Gresser, and Johann Forster, prepared a document that treated adiaphora in detail, along with criticism of the Interim's doctrine of justification and episcopal jurisdiction.[33] They insisted on maintaining the distinction between adiaphora and true service to God and rejected without qualification invocation of the saints, Corpus Christi parades, vigils and mass for the dead, the blessing or consecration of holy water, salt, and spices. They could not be reintroduced lest superstition arise and God's name be abused. But the festival calendar of the Interim could be adopted, with certain omissions, as well as mass vestments, some liturgical aspects of the Augsburg Interim, and fasting if secular governments dictated these practices. On this basis the electoral Saxon theologians argued for retaining some medieval ceremonies and usages as "adiaphora". Flacius published the memorandum without knowledge of the signatories after he had repeatedly, but in vain, challenged the Wittenberg theologians to join a common protest against the entire Interim. After Melanchthon's initial critique of the Augsburg Interim

[33] CR 7:41.

had appeared in print, Flacius issued three even sharper attacks against the Interim, under the pseudonyms Johannes Waremund, Theodor Henetus, and Christian Lauterwar. He called for total readiness to resist the new, seductive teaching. Any attempt at reconciliation he viewed as an unjustifiable concession to the declared enemies of God. Christians should not compromise but take on the cross and suffer persecution in expectation of Christ's return.[34] Others also questioned the Wittenberg theologians regarding their view of adiaphora, but Flacius determined the public exchange. He composed over ninety treatises against the "Adiaphorists". Amsdorf was his comrade-in-arms. With less public impact but just as serious and engaged was the document addressed to Melanchthon by the Hamburg Ministerium, written by Johannes Aepinus (16 May 1549) and a letter from Anton Corvinus, both expressing dissatisfaction and despair over the Wittenbergers' stance.

Flacius' first tract opposing the Leipzig Proposal appeared under the title, *Against the Shameless Devil, who has clothed himself as an angel of light, Against the New Interim* (1549), written under the pseudonym Carolus Azarias Gotsburgensis. Flacius and Gallus produced a copy of the full text of the Leipzig Proposal as well, with related documents and a critical commentary. From Agricola's own turf in Brandenburg, Melanchthon's friend Georg Buchholzer registered his criticism of the Leipzig Proposal although he did not carry his critique into print. Those who defended the Proposal were more reserved. Pfeffinger published a tract defending Melanchthon; it showed that the controversy over adiaphora centered on the question of Christian and political freedom. Had anyone obeyed a government that reintroduced usages which were truly ungodly and thus violated the integrity of the church? Had secular governments any right at all to intervene in ecclesiastical affairs?[35] In private correspondence Melanchthon sought to win understanding for his position in letters and emphasized specifically, "I have never changed the teaching of my confession".[36] He had always successfully fought against the reintroduction of false teaching. Because reformational teaching remained untouched in the last analysis, he preferred servitude in externals to losing pulpits to the imperial occupation forces.

---

[34] Preger, *Flacius*, 1:108–34.
[35] Pfeffinger, *Von den traditionibus/ceremoniis*… (Frankfurt/O, 1550).
[36] CR 8:841, MBWR 7945.

Argumentation

Flacius argued against Melanchthon with a series of criticisms. The so-called "Leipzig Interim" falsified Luther's teaching on justification by abandoning the expression "*sola fide*" and erred on original sin and the free will. These questions became distinct points of controversy later. Regarding ceremonies Flacius acknowledged adiaphora; theoretically, apart from a particular situation, adiaphora serve the church. He could, however, also envision situations in which an adiaphoron could become a testimony *for* or *against* the gospel. The Augsburg Interim and the Leipzig Proposal had created such a situation, one which demanded an unmistakable stance, a clear confession. Therefore, he formulated the maxim, "In the case where confession of the faith is necessary there are no adiaphora" (*nihil est adiaphoron in casus confessionis et scandali*). Adiaphora cease to be neutral and free when they are prescribed and introduced with coercion. Then they divert the focus of the faithful from God's true Word and irresponsibly refocus on the so-called adiaphora. Measures that would change church life so abruptly would necessarily appear to the common people as a return to the Roman church. Clearly in this extreme situation, Flacius argued, these measures demanded the necessity of confessing the faith. Such neglect of, and contempt for, the simple folk's needs for the sake of political pressures meant violating one's own conscience.

Melanchthon, on the contrary, sharply divided the sphere of adiaphora from that of the faith. Therefore, the attacks from Magdeburg not only elicited his outrage; they baffled him. His reaction to the Interim in the Leipzig Proposal had preserved the confession of the Reformation. As long as the teaching of the Reformation could be preached from the pulpits, changes in ritual could not have bad consequences. If secular authorities demanded the introduction of such adiaphora, or at least regarded them as necessary, why not agree? Melanchthon also had the practical consequence in view. If preachers left their congregations as an act of confession against new ceremonies, they would leave the field to the Reformation's adversary. He also questioned whether it was worthwhile to arouse unrest because of externals since, at least in Saxony, proper teaching was being preserved, while Evangelicals in other European lands were enduring severe pressure because of their *teaching*. Melanchthon believed that secular authorities had a right to play a role in the externals of church life and that he had the possibility of influencing the measures his government took.

Another crucial point in the argument was the right of secular government in matters of faith. Because *Melanchthon* presumed a clear division between doctrine and external ceremonies, he could permit the government to intervene in matters of the church's external order. That would not impact existentially decisive questions of doctrine. For *Flacius* the fundamental question was different. He relativized the division between teaching and ceremonies; in so far as this distinction can be realized in reality, the specific situation determines whether ceremonies convey proper teaching. The introduction of the Interim after the defeat in a war of religion created a classical situation in which clear confession of the faith was necessary; no half-heartedness could be tolerated. News of Saxon pastors who had to leave their pastorates, driven into exile because they had not reintroduced the old ceremonies and had hesitated to accept the alterations stipulated by the Leipzig "Interim," proved the bad faith of Melanchthon's party.[37] Flacius saw no role for a discussion of adiaphora in this situation. He challenged the right of secular authorities to intervene in spiritual or ecclesiastical affairs. Especially if ceremonies become part of public confession in such contexts, every intervention by secular government must be rejected. Thus, the controversy over adiaphora became a controversy over the concept of Christian or political freedom. *Pfeffinger* personalized the dispute, reproaching Flacius for presuming to serve as defense attorney for the people, implying that his stance would lead to revolt and rebellion against established authority. The Leipzig "Interim" had guaranteed Christian freedom in faith and teaching in relationship to the neighbor; no revision or expansion of the concept was necessary.

Two points were decisive for this controversy. First, the opponents presumed different concepts of confession, developing different postures for public confession of the faith. Flacius and his comrades held a holistic view of confessing. Confession extends beyond faith and doctrine; ceremonies and liturgical ritual also convey the church's teaching. This position was totally motivated by theological concerns: political considerations should play no role whatsoever in the confession of the faith. Melanchthon and his circle defined confessing and confession strictly in terms of doctrinal content and focused it on a certain "*summa doctrinae*," which could be affected by external matters, but these could

[37] Amsdorf, *Das D. Pfeffinger seine missethat bo(e)sslich und felschlich leugnet*… (Magdeburg, 1559), fol. A2–A3.

be placed in an adjunct sphere of neutral matters. Melanchthon's position exercised a certain diplomatic flexibility, complying with political, societal needs if necessary.

Second, decisive for the course of the controversy was the relationship to secular authority. Melanchthon and his comrades entrusted the field of external ecclesiastical order to the government as the powers that God had established. Christian freedom is a matter only of the Christian's relationship to God. The external structures of ecclesiastical life fall, in contrast, into the sphere of reason and are left to the discretion of those who can deal with them most effectively, the government, as "first member of the church" (*praecipuum membrum ecclesiae*). As protector of both tables of God's law, they are to care for proper worship of God. The actions of the state were limited to external discipline.[38] Flacius held a different view. He could not appeal directly to Luther but saw a parallel in Luther's insisting less on the *duty* of the government for regulating external discipline as its "*service in love*" as an "emergency bishop" when necessary. Flacius went beyond his theological model, Luther, in challenging every right of the state in ecclesiastical affairs. The sphere of confession, which embraced also external structures, had to remain free from all governmental intervention. That did not mean that Flacius sought a church without external discipline and structures but simply that they were the purview of the church, not secular government.

The Majoristic Controversy

Presuppositions

The Majoristic controversy grew out of the controversy over the Leipzig Proposal; it addressed the relationship of faith and works. Luther and Melanchthon had treated this question with different emphases while never disagreeing on the need for both a clear distinction between the two and the necessity of viewing faith, God's gift, as the source of good works (in opposition to medieval views that made salvation conditional on works in some way). Melanchthon's reaction to Roman Catholic accusations of antinomianism in Wittenberg theology, to Johann Agricola's position banning the law from the Christian life, and

[38] Cf. Dingel, "Kirchenverfassung, III" in *RGG*[4] 4: 1322.

to the immorality he encountered in the Saxon visitations, led him to posit a third use of the law that informed believers of what they must do as a consequence of God's gift of salvation through faith. In the controversy over Caspar Cruciger's claiming that remorse is a "*sine qua non*" for justification, Luther had formulated theses "On Justification" (10 October 1536), which insisted on the connection between justification by faith and the beginning of the new life in Christ. Good works are necessary but do not function in any way as a cause of salvation.[39] Luther continued to emphasize, as did Melanchthon, that faith alone justifies sinners but that justification and new life in Christ belong inseparably together. Anxious to preserve a repentant spirit in believers, Melanchthon defended his contention that remorse has to precede justification and works must follow it as fruits of faith. But he also made it clear that he never called into doubt the forensic character of justification, which is not won by human power but bestowed by God, and salvation by faith alone.

Cause and Course of the Controversy

Melanchthon's memorandum for the conference in Meissen contained formulations that aroused offense over more than adiaphora. Melanchthon had addressed the Augsburg Interim's doctrine of justification: "We are not going to argue over the little word "*sola*" (in "by faith *alone*") but say and confess that we must have and retain in ourselves the other virtues [in addition to faith] and good intentions, but above these other virtues must stand trust in God's Son…; it must overshadow all other virtues".[40] This formula indicated to his foes that he was on the way to abandoning justification "by faith alone". Amsdorf and others could concede that Luther and even the apostle Paul were able to speak clearly and correctly of justification without the word "only". But that did not alter their suspicion of Melanchthon. The situation after the Interim's promulgation demanded clear confession of the faith, and Amsdorf regarded abandoning the "alone" as highly dangerous since it would inevitably lead to rapprochement with the papacy.

Melanchthon's position appeared in the Leipzig Proposal's statement on repentance: "Repentance, going to confession, and absolution *and everything connected with them* are to be diligently taught and proclaimed,

[39] WA 39,1:96,6–8.
[40] CR 6:910, MBWR #5170.

admonishing the people to go to their priest for confession, thereby admonishing them to *prayer, fasting, and alms*".[41] The Interim's opponents saw in the definition of "everything connected with them" as "prayer, fasting and alms" a return to the medieval doctrine of the performance of satisfactions as part of the sacrament of confession. This article mentioned the evangelical understanding of faith as the essential element in repentance not at all.[42] Gallus and Flacius labeled this position a starting point for recatholicizing public teaching.

In Melanchthon's circle especially his Wittenberg colleague Georg Major[43] took Melanchthon's side and argued for the necessity of good works for salvation. Major tried to explain himself in a tract, *Georg Major's Answer to the Honorable Nikolaus von Amsdorf's Publication* (1552), protesting that he had never expressed doubt about "faith alone" in justification. At the same time he affirmed the phrase, "good works are necessary to salvation".[44] This began a long controversy, in which Flacius, Gallus, and others supported Amsdorf. The dispute intensified when Major preached on the question in January 1552, in Mansfeld, where he was serving as superintendent. The Mansfeld clergy called him to account; Major published (against Melanchthon's advice) his *Sermon on the Conversion of Saint Paul and Other God-fearing People* (1553). Flacius mocked it as the "long commentary". It clarified Major's teaching in detail, affirmed justification "by faith alone," and rejected all human merit. Faith alone bestows salvation, but to preserve it good works must flow from it. They are not meritorious [*meritum*], but obligatory [*debitum*]; they are the new obedience, fruits of faith, performance of righteousness that God requires. Therefore, it is "highly necessary that if you do not perform them, it is a sign that faith is dead, false, faked, falsely claimed".[45] Major wished to prevent the consequences possible when "faith alone" is overemphasized. He feared that merely relying on God's grace and the gift of faith could encourage libertinism and

---

[41] CR 7:261, MBWR #5388.

[42] Otto Ritschl, *Dogmengeschichte des Protestantismus*, 4 vols. (Leipzig, 1908–1927), 2:376.

[43] Timothy J. Wengert, "Georg Major (1502–1574), Defender of Wittenberg's Faith and Melanchthonian Exegete," in *Melanchthon in seinen Schülern*, ed. Heinz Scheible (Wiesbaden, 1997), pp. 129–56; Irene Dingel, "Der Majoristische Streit in seinen historischen und theologischen Zusammenhängen," in *Politik und Bekenntnis*, pp. 231–47.

[44] *Auff des Ehrenwirdigen Herren Niclas von Ambsdorff schrifft… wider Georgen Maior… Antwort Georg: Maior* (Wittenberg, 1552).

[45] *Ein Sermon von S. Pauli vnd aller Gottfu(e)rchtigen menschen bekerung zu Gott* (s.l., 1553), fol. D3.

produce moral negligence, so that the Christian's new life would not look different from the old. The person who lives in sin must have a dead faith. And the opposite must be true: good works contribute to preserving salvation. Major's statements were unclear because they awakened the impression that works were equal to faith and another condition for justification. That would truly be a step from the reformational doctrine of justification to the medieval works-righteousness. Therefore, in his *Confession on the Article of Justification* (1558) Major declared that he was prepared to abandon this formulation. But the controversy did not end.

Flacius' position was not far from Major's, but he regarded his former colleague's formulation as extremely problematic because these concepts "salvation" and "forgiveness of sins" or "justification" were often understood synonymously. If salvation is equated with justification and forgiveness, Major's formulation returned to medieval understandings and could burden consciences. So Flacius insisted that works have no function in justification and giving assurance of salvation. This discussion aimed at terminological clarity. Flacius focused on the relationship of the individual with God (where works do not bestow worth in God's sight), Major on the relationship with the neighbor (where works express righteousness toward other people).

Amsdorf's reaction was different. He advocated *That This Proposition "Good works are Detrimental to salvation" Is a Proper, True, Christian Proposition* (1559). Luther had used this expression in the early days of the Reformation to emphasize that sinners cannot trust their own works as means of attaining grace.[46] Amsdorf also pursued his critique of Major against his only Ernestine associate who defended Major, Justus Menius, superintendent of Gotha. The two served together as parish visitors in 1554. Amsdorf demanded condemnation of several of Major's writings, but Menius refused. He also taught that salvation could be lost by sinning and so regarded the life which the Holy Spirit produces in the Christian as necessary for salvation. He emphasized that he had never actually taught that good works are necessary for salvation. Nonetheless, controversy erupted between him and Flacius' cohorts. In 1556 Menius had to defend his position at a synod in Eisenach. It passed the

[46] Robert Kolb, "Good Works are Detrimental to Salvation, Amsdorf's Use of Luther's Words in Controversy," *Renaissance and Reformation/Renaissance et Réforme* 4 (1980), 136–51.

following resolutions, which Menius also accepted: 1. The statement, "good works are necessary for salvation" is acceptable in the doctrine of the law, "in the abstract and theoretically," but should nonetheless be avoided. 2. The statement must be rejected in the doctrine of justification. 3. For new obedience good works are necessary, not for salvation but for other reasons. 4. Only faith justifies and saves. 5. Good works are necessary to preserve salvation.[47] During the controversy Menius died in Leipzig (11 August 1558). The controversy continued to simmer; in 1568–1569 the attempt was made in the Altenburg colloquy to reconcile these differences, but without success. The alienation between the two sides trapped both in the impossibility of understanding the other's concerns.

Major and Menius wanted to emphasize the connection between justifying faith and new life. In no way did they want to rob faith of its significance for justification. But this showed that the situation which developed after the Interim could tolerate different theological expressions only with difficulty. The position of the Gnesio-Lutherans, who also insisted on the necessity of good works (Amsdorf prepared a manuscript for print, never actually published, entitled, "Good Works Are Necessary for the Christian Faith"),[48] justifiably sought to guard against the danger of a subtle undermining of reformational teaching. Melanchthon surprisingly remained largely outside this fray. Not under attack himself, he tried with advice and memoranda to reach reconciliation, particularly striving for clarity on the concept of "necessity". He argued that new obedience is necessary but not necessary to gain merit in God's sight.

The Antinomian Controversy

Presuppositions

Among those controversies which here can be only briefly mentioned are those labeled "antinomian". In 1527–1529 and again 1537–1540 Luther and Melanchthon had intense disagreements with their friend and former student, Johann Agricola, over his rejection of a place for the law in the Christian life. The Wittenberg theologians viewed

[47] Matthias Richter, *Gesetz und Heil: Eine Untersuchung zur Vorgeschichte und zum Verlauf des sogenannten Zweiten Antinomistischen Streits* (Göttingen, 1996), pp. 132–69.

[48] Kolb, *Amsdorf*, pp. 163–64.

Agricola's denial that the law functions for believers as a severe threat to the proper distinction of law and gospel. They feared that Agricola's theology would encourage immorality and unfaithful living in parishioners (though Agricola taught that the gospel effects repentance and teaches good works). These disputes are interesting for four reasons. First, they foreshadow the disputes that took place after the Interim in the exchanges over "the third use of the law". Second, they show that the *concerns* of confessionalization emerged theologically before the great controversies within Protestantism. The fact that the reformational movement at an early point could be held together through Luther's and Melanchthon's authority prevented division over doctrine. Third, theological plurality could still be integrated at this relatively early stage of the Reformation into the mainstream. This was possible as long as the leading personalities functioned as authorities, and as long as there was no direct, concrete threat to the evangelical confession in the political sphere. Fourth, this changed abruptly in 1548. *Theologically*, that is seen in the controversy over the "third use of the law" an outgrowth of the Majoristic controversy. The fully altered religious-*political* conditions triggered the controversy, which strove for unifying the plurality of theological positions.

Course of the Controversy

The "antinomians" of the 1550s and 1560s reacted against Melanchthon's development of a "third use" for the law, that of Christian instruction, alongside its use as a regulating force for an orderly society and as the crushing power of God's plan for human life when sinners collide with it.[49] This reaction arose in the midst of the Majoristic controversy. The disagreements surfaced in reaction to the Eisenach Synod's attempt to explicate the Wittenberg understanding of the law, specifically its claim that good works were theoretically necessary for salvation "abstractly, in the doctrine of the law". Amsdorf, Anton Otho, pastor in Nordhausen, Andreas Poach, pastor in Erfurt, and the school rector and humanist, Michael Neander, opposed this view, fearful that it accepted a medieval view of human performance and merit as the determining factor in attaining righteousness before God (instead of God's grace and merciful choice of his people). Flacius, along with Johannes Wigand, Joachim Mörlin, and other "Gnesio-Lutherans"

[49] See Wengert, *Law and Gospel*, pp. 177–210.

defended Melanchthon's position in this regard. They did so to uphold human responsibility.[50]

A second dispute over the third use of the law and the language used to discuss new obedience broke out within the faculty of the University of Frankfurt/Oder. There the theological professor Andreas Musculus insisted that the believer's good works arise "spontaneously" "from a free and joyous spirit," and cannot be labeled "necessary," even for Christian living. Abdias Praetorius, a former associate of Wigand and other Gnesio-Lutherans but in principle close to Melanchthon, insisted that good works are necessary for the Christian life. Musculus finally had to compromise when he participated in the composition of the Formula of Concord but left his mark on its sixth article ("on the third use of the law," Solid Declaration, paragraphs 17–18).[51]

A related dispute, provoked by Melanchthon's use of broader definitions of the terms "gospel" (for the entire biblical message rather than as a synonym for the proclamation of God's grace and the forgiveness of sins) and "repentance" (for both turning from sin and turning to Christ), flickered at the sidelines of these discussions. Though no one objected to the broader definitions, Gnesio-Lutherans, especially Johannes Wigand, protested the lack of clarity these discussions rendered in the presentation of the unqualified, unconditional mercy of God in Christ.[52] All these disputes demonstrate how concerned Gnesio-Lutherans were for the clarity of the gospel and how concerned Philippists were for the life of new obedience, concerns that all in both groups shared.

The Synergistic Controversy

Presuppositions

In his *Loci communes* of 1521/1522 Melanchthon had reproduced Luther's understanding of the bound will. The human will is completely under the control of its emotions and can produce nothing good. Nothing takes place apart from God's will. All human actions are placed within divine *predestination*. Faith itself is a gift of God, produced by God, not a human accomplishment. These statements do not occur in the

---

[50] Richter, *Gesetz und Heil*, pp. 170–207, 251–329.

[51] Ibid., pp. 208–50.

[52] Christoph Pezel, *APOLOGIA VERAE DOCTRINAE DE DEFINITIONE EVANGELII*… (Wittenberg, 1571), Wigand, *DE ANTINOMIA VETERI ET NOVA*… (Jena, 1571), Paul Crell, *SPONGIA DE DEFINITIONE EVANGELII*… (Wittenberg, 1571).

second edition of the *Loci* (1535). Contrary to older research, this shift in his viewpoint did not take place in the context of Luther's dispute with Erasmus (1524–1526). Melanchthon's commentary on Colossians of 1527 criticized Erasmus' position, defending Luther's concerns.[53] But the *Loci* of 1535 contained fundamental changes in Melanchthon's position. His concern was two-fold. God's holiness makes it impossible that he could be a "cause of sin". However, human beings have a positive moral nature that must be taken seriously; Melanchthon emphasized the responsibility of human creatures for their own conduct. Sinners sin as fully responsible creatures. Neither fate nor predestination causes them to sin.

This had implications for the doctrine of original sin. Even if it is a profound corruption of the human person, rendering him or her unable to produce what is truly good, nonetheless, the will has the capability of making decisions that can dominate the emotions. This capability to decide stands alongside God's universal will to save sinners and must be exercised responsibly. For human beings react to God's promise in his Word and to the working of the Holy Spirit either by affirming or rejecting them. Melanchthon taught that "conversion" has three concurrent causes: God's Word, the Holy Spirit, and the human will. The last Latin edition of his *Loci* (1543) stated, "Three causes of good action are the Word of God, the Holy Spirit, and the human will, which either assents to God's Word or rejects it". In and of itself—and this is clear when he speaks of "agreeing" and "not rejecting"—the human will can indeed do nothing. The will is moved to action from outside itself, by God. Thus, Melanchthon maintains both the personal responsibility of the individual and also the corruption of human nature through original sin, the "corruption of the nature" and justification "by faith alone," which the Holy Spirit creates. For the conduct of the will when it affirms or rejects does not take place on the basis of its own powers. It merits nothing.[54] Nevertheless, some of Melanchthon's phrases led others to accuse him of "synergism" (from the Greek *synergia*, cooperation). Clearly, he did provide tinder for theological discussion, even controversy. Parallels to medieval concepts and language were easy to draw. Finally, the human will's act of deciding seemed like semi-pelagian

[53] Timothy J. Wengert, *Human Freedom, Christian Righteousness. Philip Melanchthon's Exegetical Dispute with Erasmus of Rotterdam* (Oxford, 1998).

[54] Robert Kolb, *Bound Choice, Election, and Wittenberg Theological Method From Martin Luther to the Formula of Concord* (Grand Rapids, 2005), 70–102.

teaching. Melanchthon's speaking of a cooperating function of the will could not have done anything else than awaken the impression that he was ascribing to human powers a decisive function in justification.

Causes and Course of the controversy

Critical for causing this controversy was the statement in the Leipzig Proposal:

> Although God does not make humans righteous through the merit of their own works…, but through his mercy, freely given, apart from our merit…, at the same time the merciful God does not work with human beings as if they were blocks of wood [*truncus*] but draws them so that their will cooperates if they are old enough to understand. For such people do not receive the benefits of Christ who are not moved in will and heart by God's grace that precedes all else, when God's wrath terrifies them and they despise their sin. For sin creates enmity between God and human beings…, and therefore no one can come before the throne of grace and mercy without turning from sin in remorse.[55]

Flacius thought that by saying that God does not deal with sinners "like a block of wood" Melanchthon seemed to promote a view similar to the medieval scholastic concept of "*meritum de congruo*" [merit that is not intrinsically meritorious but accepted as such by God], which had been designed to credit human effort while admitting that the best efforts of sinners fall short of what God demands.

The publication of the Leipzig Proposal did not lead directly to the controversy. In 1555 Leipzig professor and superintendent Johann Pfeffinger, who had contributed to the composition of the Leipzig Proposal, held two disputations. In his *Propositions on the Free Will* he, like Melanchthon, stated that when the Holy Spirit works in human beings through God's Word, the person does not act "like a statue," but the agreement of his will plays a role in conversion. The cause why some gain salvation and others do not must lie in the responsibility of the individual human being. The Ernestine theologians responded with sharp criticism. The court preacher in Weimar Johann Stolz published 110 theses against Pfeffinger. The controversy moved from the theologians' plane when Amsdorf published his *Public Confession of the Pure Teaching of the Gospel and Confutation of Contemporary Ravers* in 1558. It reproduced Pfeffinger's teaching in distorted form, maintaining that Pfeffinger and

[55] CR 7:51–52, MBWR #5209.

his colleagues had taught that human beings can prepare themselves for grace by their own free will and situate themselves so that God can give them grace, as had Thomas Aquinas and Duns Scotus. Stolz's theses appeared in print soon thereafter, together with Flacius's *Refutation of Pfeffinger's Proposition Concerning Free Choice* and theses he prepared for disputation in Jena, where he had become professor in 1557, on the free will, refuting Pfeffinger's position. He thereby presented a theological program for directing Jena, with its orientation toward Luther, against the Philippistic-oriented universities of Wittenberg and Leipzig. Flacius aimed at defending pure teaching, as Luther had presented it. Citing Luther, he asserted that the human being behaved in a completely passive manner (*mere passive*), indeed comparable to a block of wood—actually, worse than a block of wood, not simply passive but rather striving against God's will, its foe (*hostiliter erga Dei operationem*). Original sin, which transforms the natural human creature into "the image of Satan," causes that. Sinners cannot reverse this state by their own powers. Only God can and must convert the human being.[56] In this context the invective "synergists" occurred for the first time.

His opponents were not silent. Pfeffinger answered Amsdorf in sharp tones yet in 1558,[57] explaining his position and admitting his "synergism". Pfeffinger held that it is clear that not only the reborn, liberated will is in a position to follow God's Spirit, but that the natural human will also has the capability before conversion and rebirth to pay attention to God's Spirit or oppose him. Disputations held in Jena, Leipzig, and Wittenberg did not lead toward a settlement but heightened the tensions. Flacius began to consider drafting a new, clear confession of faith and approached his new prince, Johann Friedrich the Middler, with the idea.

Flacius advised Johann Friedrich to forbid synergism as "heresy" among the evangelical theologians. Execution of this plan would send those who maintained this position into exile. The prince ordered the composition of such a confession by his theologians, with Flacius at the end directing the effort, which produced the *Weimar Book of Confutation*. It was developed also against the political background of the Frankfurt diet of evangelical princes in 1558. Melanchthon shaped the *Recess*

---

[56] Johannes Stoltz, *Refutatio propositionum Pfeffingeri de libero arbitrio* (s.l., 1558).

[57] *Antwort: D. Johan. Pfeffingers…Auff die Offentliche Bekentnis…Niclasen von Ambsdorff* (Wittenberg, 1558).

adopted there as a formula for resolving the disputes over justification, new obedience, the Lord's Supper, and adiaphora; that document sought to introduce a confessionally-binding unity of the evangelical estates in the empire.[58] Johann Friedrich and the north German cities had protested against this settlement. The *Weimar Book of Confutation*, prepared by the Jena theologians, was to serve not only to settle differences within Ernestine Saxony but also make clear the confession of the true faith beyond its borders. It rejected nine "heresies," opinions that departed from reformational thinking, in the Ernestine Saxon view, and defined proper teaching by confuting these false teachings. Its sixth section addressed the free will, rejecting any cooperation of the human will in conversion, confirming Flacius' view: "it is impossible for those who are not reborn to recognize or grasp God's will in his revealed Word, to desire something good or to carry it out… Our will to obey God or to choose the good is fully extinguished and corrupted.[59]

Although theologians at the University of Jena composed the *Book of Confutation*, it did not win unanimous approval there. Even though they had worked on an initial text, Viktorin Strigel, Flacius' colleague, and Andreas Hügel, superintendent in Jena, refused to accept the *Book* because Flacius and other colleagues, including Erasmus Sarcerius from Mansfeld and Joachim Mörlin from Braunschweig, had completely revised their draft. Hügel declined to read it from the pulpit; Strigel petitioned the duke to respect his decision of conscience. Within the context of his personal friction with Flacius, Strigel defended Melanchthon's teaching on the free will. He had previously attacked Flacius, labeling him the initiator of new teaching and attributing his battle with the Wittenberg theologians to personal ambition. The unified front of the ducal theologians appeared to be breaking up.

Theologically, the difference between the two lay in their concepts of "*conversio*". Flacius applied it to the situation when the sinner is awakened to repentance, in which the Holy Spirit gives faith, creating sinners anew as God's children. He believed that this process happens in a brief, definite, period of time. Flacius stood in Luther's tradition, but Strigel could also cite the reformer when he, in contrast to Flacius, referred to the first of the Ninety-five Theses, showing that Luther

[58] See p. 27 above.

[59] *Des Durchleuchtigen… Herrn Johans Friderichen des Mittlern… Confutationes/ Widerlegungen vnd verdamnung etlicher… Corruptelen/ Secten vnd Irrthumen…* (Jena, 1559), pp. 34–35.

viewed "*conversio*" as repentance that continues throughout life under grace. Strigel concluded that "*conversio*" included life-long repentance and ignites continuous spiritual growth. The critical difference between Strigel and the viewpoint of Flacius and also Luther lay in Strigel's failure to define conversion as a new creation, a revitalization of the spiritually dead, but rather as a reactivation of powers dormant in sinners, even before conversion—a slumbering, unconscious, but nonetheless, real power. He believed this made it possible to speak of responsible decision-making by the individual.

Against this background Flacius accused Strigel of founding a Philippist party in Jena. Since Strigel and Hügel were not prepared to resolve these differences, and it appeared that their stubborn opposition to the *Book* was disturbing public peace, the duke had them arrested. They gained freedom only through the intervention of prominent supporters. Strigel remained suspended from his professorship. New colleagues in Jena, above all Simon Musaeus, Johannes Wigand, and Matthaeus Judex, strengthened Flacius' position. Flacius was consolidating his power, but outside Ernestine Saxony these developments won disapproval. Therefore, the duke organized a public disputation to remove the differences and find a worthy solution to the tensions.

The Weimar Disputation took place 2 August 1560, at the ducal palace. The duke and his entire court were present along with the theologians. Chancellor Christian Brück presided. Of the several questions on the agenda, only the free will was discussed. Flacius and Strigel squared off, Strigel defending Melanchthon's position. He clarified his position with a picture later used in the Formula of Concord, comparing the human will to the way a magnet functions. Coated with garlic juice, the magnet loses its magnetism but remains a magnet, Strigel argued on the basis of common belief of the time. When the blood of a goat is smeared over it, it returns to its original function. Original sin, in similar manner, obstructs and extinguishes the will's functioning, to will the good. Conversion by God's Son restores the active ability of the will, heals it, and makes it able to will the good. Strigel repeated Melanchthon's formulation, found in his 1543 *Loci*: "three causes come together in conversion, the Holy Spirit moving the heart, the voice of God, and the human will which assents to the divine voice".[60]

---

[60] *DISPUTATIO DE ORIGINALI PECCATO ET LIBERO ARBITRIO INTER MATthiam Flacium Illyricum & Victorinum Strigelium* (s.l., 1562), pp. 3, 34.

The Controversy over Original Sin

Presuppositions and course of the controversy

The question of the human free will led directly to the topic of original sin. Comments on the free will and its capabilities presupposed a definition of original sin and its implications for the human condition. The Weimar Disputation focused quickly on this topic. Initially it appeared that Strigel and Flacius had no serious disagreement. Strigel declared that original sin had deprived the human will of the spiritual powers it had as God created human creatures in his own image, that a host of evils afflict sinners. They are totally corrupt, doubting God persistently, tending to do what God has forbidden, rooting out all the natural tendencies of the heart. Flacius was convinced that he and Strigel could quickly reach agreement. He shared this view of the total corruption of human nature by original sin. That included for him the complete paralysis of the free will in spiritual matters.

Strigel, however, differentiated between the substance of the human creature, body and soul, to which the *essential* properties of humanity belong, from a sphere in which original sin has caused the loss of the moral character established by God's will and its replacement through an evil character. The human substance, with its essential characteristics, cannot be lost. The essential properties of the soul, reason, will, heart, including the will's freedom from coercion and compulsion, cannot be fundamentally altered or destroyed by the corruption of original sin, Strigel contended. Original sin is something attached to the inalterable human substance; it is, in aristotelian terms, an "accident," something that belongs to a subject and can be lost without changing its substance as such. The good or evil condition of reason, will, and heart are simply (aristotelian) accidents, able to be removed, not a part of the essential substance of the human being. This meant for Strigel that before the fall into sin the free will was whole, healthy, without sin, error or any disruption of its good tendencies. Sin's invasion of the world altered the individual essential characteristics of the human being, or what is added to humanity. Reason is no longer illuminated but instead captive to darkness and error; the will is not directed toward God but desires what opposes him; the heart's wishes oppose God's will, are disturbed, confused, driven by selfishness. Nonetheless, the essential elements of the will are not destroyed but simply weakened, as he illustrated with his reference to magnets.

Flacius opposed the domination of philosophy when expressing theological concerns. He believed that Strigel's teaching enunciated the profound corruption of the human being theologically but his philosophical explanations of the free will denied that corruption. He demanded, "prove to me from God's Word that what you also recognize as the truth in the teaching of original sin does not affect the understanding of the free will".[61] He reproached Strigel for giving philosophical categories priority over the theological and held it improper to draw false conclusions from philosophical principles, such as Aristotle's distinction between substance and accident. Strigel insisted that it was proper to describe certain things without specific testimony in Scripture; in academic circles the usual distinction of substance and accidence was one such instance. Strigel correctly identified this distinction as widely-used; he was wrong in thinking it could help understand the biblical teaching on original sin and the free will. Flacius recognized correctly why that would not work, but he nonetheless decided to use this terminology which could only set the question in a false framework.

For Flacius got the impression that Strigel regarded original sin only as a mere accident in the essence of the human being, which remains in and of itself good. Thus, Flacius charged, Strigel improperly minimized the corruption of sin. Strigel's comparison with magnets strengthened his conviction. Flacius held to his conviction that original sin not simply inherently weakened human powers but instead totally corrupted them, even destroyed them. Since Strigel drew the conclusion that in fallen sinners the power to do the good and moral remained, Flacius felt challenged to emphasize the total sinfulness of the human being. This brought him to the formulation that original sin had become the substance of the fallen human creature. The human being was so permeated by sin in his essence that there was nothing good in him; he could produce nothing good and was in need of total, absolute redemption, Flacius emphasized.

Flacius could claim Luther as the source for this view. He had said in his Genesis lectures "that the fall into sin had caused such a transformation of the whole person that its essential characteristics that constitute its being in the image of God are not longer present".[62] Luther also used the expression "substance of sin," though he emphasized that

[61] Cited by Preger, *Flacius*, 2:199.
[62] Ibid., 2:201.

he was not using it in an aristotelian sense. Luther was describing the depth of human sinfulness, through its permeation of human nature, in contrast to medieval teaching on original human righteousness, which came as a "*donum superadditum*" (added gift) to human creatures. Flacius appropriated this way of speaking although he recognized its problems. He could not permit saying that original sin is an accident. He distinguished "material substance" from "formal substance" or "the form of the substance," which he equated with the "image of God" (Gen. 1:27). The fall into sin transformed this image, Flacius held, into an "image of the devil". In this way original sin became the substance of the fallen human being. Strigel taught, on the contrary, that original sin is a "deprivation" and "corruption" of all human powers, particularly the mind, will, and heart. Original sin is therefore only a corruption, which—as accident—adheres to the substance. Flacius did not fairly address Strigel and his supporters when he attributed to them merely a "corruption of accidents" and not the "corruption of the substance," that is, the corruption of the entire person. Key to the fruitlessness of the controversy and the intensifying of the opposing positions was the inadequacy of the Aristotelian concepts as applied, and the accompanying confusion of conceptions.

Flacius' unwillingness to compromise his formulations, that original sin belonged to the substance of the human creature, and was that substance, drove him and his adherents, the so-called "Flacians," into enduring opposition to the general Lutheran position. This finally disempowered them. Flacius' doctrine of original sin caused a schism within Gnesio-Lutherans ranks. Even his close comrades, such as Johann Wigand, Tilemann Heshusius, and Simon Musaeus drew away from him and labeled his teaching false. The Formula of Concord rejected his doctrine. His followers found haven in evangelical areas in Austria, where they survived for a generation.[63]

Neither the question of the cooperation of the human will in conversion nor the question of the definition of original sin as accident or substance found an answer at the Weimar Disputation. On 8 August Johann Friedrich ended the six-day exchange. The fact that no theological solution had been found was telling. It became clear to the duke that Flacius had forfeited his claim to be the church's official voice in ducal Saxony. The duke forbade the opponents to continue their

[63] See Dingel, *Concordia*, pp. 467–541.

controversy; Flacius and his followers opposed this decision. Voices outside Saxony demanded an end to the controversy; within the duchy Flacius and his comrades opposed the duke's plans for a consistory to govern the church. This rupture led to the exile of Flacius and his colleagues in December 1561. For Flacius and his family this initiated a long and uncertain pilgrimage, with successive exiles. Strigel also left ducal Saxony after gaining rehabilitation at court. He held lectures at the University of Leipzig and later went to Heidelberg, dying there in 1565 at age 45. In 1567 "Gnesio-Lutherans" returned to leadership in ducal Saxony, after Johann Friedrich's brother, Johann Wilhelm, assumed power when Johann Friedrich suffered arrest by the emperor. Johann Wilhelm restored the Weimar *Book of Confutation* to its status as a norm for public teaching.

These controversies over Luther's and Melanchthon's anthropology stand in the shadow of these mentors' own differing accents within a common view that held human beings responsible for their own performance but at the same time emphasized that God the Creator is totally responsible for everything in the world. Rather than homogenizing and harmonizing these two responsibilities the Wittenberg theologians strove to keep them in tension, in part through their distinction of law and gospel. Their disciples struggled to do so as well, with varying degrees of success.[64]

The Osiandrian Controversy

Unrelated to the controversies that flowed from the Leipzig Proposal was that provoked by Andreas Osiander, who had suffered exile from Nuremberg because of the Augsburg Interim. Duke Albrecht of Prussia, who had become a follower of Luther through Osiander's preaching two decades earlier, gave him leadership roles in Prussia, where he revealed a strikingly different interpretation of justification by faith than the Wittenberg circle held. Influenced by his early studies in Hebraic humanistic literature and therefore by the Kabbala, Osiander defined the ultimate reality as God's essence and found the bestowal of true righteousness on sinners by God's word of forgiveness a legal fiction. He taught instead that faith appropriates the divine essence of Christ as its righteousness in God's sight. Christ makes sinners righteous by

[64] The argument of Kolb, *Bound Choice*.

dwelling in them with his essential divine righteousness. The Trinity shares his image, his righteousness, with the sinner. Osiander largely ignored Christ's redeeming work, accentuating instead reconciliation through his indwelling.[65]

Osiander's view quickly alienated him from several Wittenberg-trained colleagues in Königsberg, among them the ducal librarian, Martin Chemnitz, and Joachim Mörlin; these two later formed a team leading the church in Braunschweig. Their critique of Osiander's doctrine won them exile but also support across the spectrum of Wittenberg students despite disagreements on other issues. Melanchthon, Flacius, Amsdorf, Menius, and many others pointed out the flaws in Osiander's thinking from the Wittenberg perspective. This dispute caused Chemnitz and others to sharpen their expression of their definitions of Christ's person and work, justification, atonement, and related issues.[66] Supported by very few theologians, Osiander's importance was sustained after his death (17 October 1552) chiefly by old friends in Nuremberg and those obligated to the duke in Prussia.[67] Efforts by Johannes Brenz and other Swabian friends of Osiander to mediate the dispute failed. Osiander's deviation from Wittenberg articulation of the biblical message served chiefly to hone Lutheran teaching regarding God's Word as that which determines reality, Christ's person as the hypostatic union of God and human creature, and justification on the basis of Christ's work as the substitute who atoned for sinners condemned to death and the savior whose resurrection gives sinners life.

Controversies over the Lord's Supper and Christology

Another set of controversies only loosely related to those flowing from the Leipzig Proposal sought to defend and define Lutheran teaching on the Lord's Supper and related Christological issues. Indeed, all Gnesio-Lutherans held a similar position on the Lord's Supper and largely the

---

[65] *Andreas Osiander der Ältere, Gesamtausgabe, Band 9: Schriften und Briefe 1549 bis August 1551*, ed. Gerhard Müller and Gottfried Seebaß (Gütersloh, 1994), pp. 450–91; Theodor Mahlmann, *Das neue Dogma der lutherischen Christologie, Problem und Geschichte seiner Begründung* (Gütersloh, 1969), pp., 93–124; Martin Stupperich, *Osiander in Preussen, 1549–1552* (Berlin, 1973).

[66] Ibid., pp. 120–367; Mahlmann, *Christologie*, pp. 205–38.

[67] Jörg Rainer Fligge, "Herzog Albrecht von Preussen und der Osiandrismus, 1522–1568," Th.D. dissertation, University of Bonn, 1972.

same on the fundamental Christological formulations; among Philippists a wider spectrum of teaching evolved.

Presuppositions

An essay of this length could be devoted alone to the controversies over the Lord's Supper and Christology, echoes of Luther's earlier engagement with Ulrich Zwingli and others he labeled "Sacramentarians". Luther followed his Ockhamist instructors in contending that God determined all possibilities and therefore indeed had chosen to make it possible for "the finite" to convey and deliver "the infinite" in specific instances involved in conveying his Word. Later 16th-century opponents, adapting a phrase from medieval scholastic doctrine, contended that it could not. Luther supported his definition of the "true" presence of Christ's body and blood with four arguments. His central axiom asserted that when Christ said, "this is my body," his words can be trusted; God's omnipotence makes it possible for bread and wine to convey his body and blood if he says so. Luther also argued that Christ is "essential, natural, true, complete God and human creature in one person, individual and inseparable". He used the ancient church's teaching of the "communication of attributes" (*communicatio idiomatum*: that the two natures of Christ share their characteristics within the personal union of God and human being) to explain that the characteristic of being present in more than one form and place can be communicated by the divine nature to the human nature. Against Zwingli's argument that Christ's human nature ascended to sit at God's right hand and cannot be anywhere else, Luther observed that the biblical usage of the term "right hand of God," as the locus of God's power, is everywhere. Finally, he held that God is present in several modes and can also be present in sacramental form within the personal union of divine and human natures.[68]

Zwingli's death (1531) and agreement between the Wittenberg theologians and south German theologians led by Martin Bucer of Strasbourg in the Wittenberg Concord (1536) brought about a lull in this dispute. It arose anew after the "Zurich Consensus" of 1549 between the Genevan church, led by John Calvin, and the Zurich church, led

[68] WA 26:326,29–327,32; LW 37:214–215. See Walther Köhler, *Zwingli und Luther*, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1924, Gütersloh, 1953).

by Heinrich Bullinger,[69] began circulating in northern Germany. In his *Collection of Opinions on the Lord's Supper which Contradict Each Other from the Sacramentarians' Books* (1552) Joachim Westphal, pastor in Hamburg, called on Calvin to return to his original position on the Lord's Supper; Calvin's reply initiated a series of exchanges.[70] At about the same time, supported by his colleague Johannes Bötker, Westphal defended a Lutheran pastor in neighboring Bremen, Johann Timann, in his struggle against the views of his colleague Albert Hardenberg, who represented Bucer's early position on the Supper in a decade-long exchange.[71] Bötker and Westphal emphasized the Christological argument in support of the true presence of Christ's body and blood in the Lord's Supper, in somewhat the same manner as Swabian theologians led by Johannes Brenz and Jakob Andreae in Württemberg;[72] most of Westphal's Gnesio-Lutheran comrades relied chiefly on the argument from the literal interpretation of the words of institution of the Supper and God's reliability and omnipresence.

The topic took on a new significance at the end of the 1560s when a new generation of theologians in Wittenberg itself developed a spiritualizing interpretation of the presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper and followed Melanchthon's impulses in abandoning Luther's Christological argument for that presence.[73] Melanchthon defined the communication of attributes as a rhetorical or dialectical expression rather than a "real" or metaphysical description of Christ's natures. He held that the characteristics and actions of both human and divine natures can truly be ascribed to the whole person of Christ, while each nature remains, as the council of Chalcedon (451) had taught, unchanged, inseparable, undivided, unmixed. This meant that it is proper to say that the person of Christ, as God and human being, suffered and died, is almighty, present everywhere, and omniscient. But some Lutheran theologians, e.g. Brenz and his followers in Württemberg, held that the

---

[69] Bizer, *Studien zur Geschichte des Abendmahlsstreits im 16. Jahrhundert* (Gütersloh, 1940; reprt. Darmstadt, 1962), pp. 243–74; Paul Rorem, "Calvin and Bullinger on the Lord's Supper," LQ 2 (1988), 155–84, 357–89.

[70] Wim Janse, "Joachim Westphal's Sacramentology," LQ 22 (2008), (forthcoming).

[71] Mahlmann, *Christologie*, pp. 28–61, 82–92; cf. Wim Janse, *Albert Hardenberg als Theologe. Profil eines Bucer-Schülers* (Leiden, 1994); Bizer, *Studien*, pp. 275–84.

[72] Mahlmann, *Christologie*, pp. 44–92, 125–204; cf. Hans Christian Brandy, *Die späte Christologie des Johannes Brenz* (Tübingen, 1991).

[73] Mahlmann, *Christologie*, pp. 62–85; Johannes Hund, *Das Wort ward Fleisch. Eine systematisch-theologische Untersuchung zur Debatte um die Wittenberger Christologie und Abendmahlslehre in den Jahren 1567 bis 1574* (Göttingen, 2006), pp. 66–96.

two natures had such a complete communion that the human nature of Christ enjoys divine characteristics, even though they do not properly belong to that nature. Indeed, during his earthly life Jesus did not put these attributes to use. But after his ascension and exaltation to God's right hand, he is present everywhere also according to his human nature. The "communication of attributes" was for them not merely a dialectical expression but a positive fact. The Württemberg theologians articulated this view in a colloquy with Calvinist representatives of the church of the Palatinate at Maulbronn in 1564.[74]

Others, e.g. a group of Lower Saxon theologians whose spokesman was Martin Chemnitz of Braunschweig, expressed the position in a more nuanced way. Like their colleagues in Württemberg, they taught that the personal union of Christ's two natures and his exaltation to God's right hand effected a communication of divine characteristics to the human nature. But this did not mean that Christ is omnipresent in his human nature per se, in general. They preferred simply to affirm the biblical witness of the words of institution rather than speculate and theorize about the concept of omnipresence. Christological argumentation served them only as a secondary support for the teaching of the true presence of Christ's body and blood in the sacrament. Christ is present also in his human nature where the biblical promise has placed him, that is, where he wills to be so present. What Swiss theologians, especially Theodore Beza, called the "doctrine of ubiquity" was therefore anchored in the context of God's sovereign will. Chemnitz formulated his understanding of Christ's presence as a "multivolipresence:" the human nature is present in many places as God wills it to be present.[75]

Cause and course of the controversy

After Melanchthon's death in 1560, his successor Paul Eber represented his views in moderate form, arousing some suspicions among Gnesio-Lutherans,[76] but leading the faculty in opposing the Heidelberg Catechism's doctrine of the Lord's Supper.[77] When Eber died in 1569,

---

[74] Bizer, *Studien*, pp. 335–52.

[75] *DE DUABUS NATURIS IN CHRISTO* (Jena, 1570; extensively revised second edition, Leipzig, 1578); in translation, *The Two Natures in Christ*, trans. J.A.O. Preus (St. Louis, 1971).

[76] His *Vom heiligen Sacrament des Leibs vnd Bluts… CHRISTI Vnterricht und Bekentnis…* (Wittenberg, 1562) was criticized by the Mansfeld Ministerium, *CONFESSIO ET SENTENTIA… DE DOGMATIS…* (Eisleben, 1565), fols. 2a–46b.

[77] Ritschl, *Dogmengeschichte*, IV:35–36.

leadership in theological discussions in Wittenberg fell to a member of the medical faculty, Melanchthon's son-in-law, Caspar Peucer,[78] and the theologian Christoph Pezel,[79] who had never known Luther and spent only a brief period in Wittenberg during Melanchthon's lifetime. Their spiritualizing view of Christ's presence in the Lord's Supper informed a new catechism published anonymously but composed chiefly by Pezel in 1571 to replace a catechism for secondary schools by David Chytraeus, which was banned by electoral decree. This so-called Wittenberg Catechism, issued in Latin, aroused opposition because critics alleged it contained "Calvinistic" tendencies (although, more accurately, they were following one trajectory out of Melanchthon's later thinking that differed from others of his disciples, such as Chemnitz and Chytraeus).[80] That jeopardized the status of Electoral Saxony under the Religious Peace of Augsburg, which guaranteed imperial legitimacy only to adherents of the Augsburg Confession (although the Palatine government claimed that its teaching on the Lord's Supper, which owed much to Calvin and other Swiss theologians, reproduced the teaching of the Altered Augsburg Confession of 1540).

This criticism caused Elector August to forbid publication of the German translation of the new Catechism. The theological faculty did produce the *Wittenberg Questions*, a German text that further explained the ascension of Christ and his sitting at God's right hand. Critics found that it held a position that agreed with Genevan, Calvinist, interpretation of the Lord's Supper in teaching that Christ's human nature is bound to the place in heaven where God's throne is located until his return at the end of time. This constituted a denial that his exaltation

---

[78] *Caspar Peucer (1525–1602). Wissenschaft, Glaube und Politik im konfessionellen Zeitalter*, ed. Hans-Peter Hasse und Günther Wartenberg (Leipzig, 2004).

[79] Richard Wetzel, "Christoph Pezel (1539–1604), Die Vorreden zu seinen Melanchthon-Editionen als Propagandatexte der 'Zweiten Reformation,'" in *Melanchthon in seinen Schülern*, pp. 465–568.

[80] This and the following documents are found in *Controversia et Confessio.Bd. 8 [1, 2]. Die Debatte um die Wittenberger Abendsmahlslehre und Christologie (1570–1574)*, ed. Irene Dingel (Göttingen, 2008). On these and subsequent developments, see Ernst Koch, "Auseinandersetzungen um die Autorität von Philipp Melanchthon und Martin Luther in Kursachsen im Vorfeld der Konkordienformel von 1577," Ljb 59 (1992), pp. 128–59, and idem, "Der kursächsische Philippismus und seine Krise in den 1560er und 1570er Jahren," in *Die reformierte Konfessionalisierung in Deutschland: das Problem der "Zweiten Reformation"*, ed. Heinz Schilling (Gütersloh, 1986), pp. 60–77; Hund, *Das Wort ward Fleisch*, pp. 209–613; and Hans-Peter Hasse, *Zensur theologischer Bücher in Kursachsen im konfessionellen Zeitalter. Studien zur kursächsischen Literatur- und Religionspolitik in den Jahren 1569 bis 1575* (Leipzig, 2000).

makes possible a presence of his body and blood in the elements of the Supper that convey forgiveness of sins, life, and salvation. Chemnitz and Mörlin joined several other individuals and ministeria, as well as the theological faculty of Jena, in criticizing the Wittenberg position, as did a Philippist electoral Saxon theologian, Nikolaus Selnecker. The Wittenberg faculty produced a massive defense, the *Firm Foundation* of 1571,[81] and proceeded to compose a public confession of faith for their land, the "Dresden Consensus" (October 1571). Its attempt to integrate elements of Luther's sacramental teaching with Melanchthon's created a certain ambiguity that enabled Reformed theologians, e.g., those in Heidelberg, to embrace it.[82]

The turmoil over the electoral Saxon developments came to a head after the publication of an anonymous volume entitled *Lucid Explanation of the Lord's Supper*. In the storm of criticism it elicited, its publisher, Ernst Vögelin of Leipzig, attributed it to a deceased Silesian physician and former Melanchthon student, Joachim Curaeus. Its distribution outside normal channels and its contents identified it as "sacramentarian". It rejected Luther's description of Christ's presence in the Lord's Supper with the concepts of "sacramental union" (of bread and wine with his body and blood), "oral partaking" (communicants receive his body and blood through the mouth, not only through faith), and "partaking by the impious" (also the impious receive his body and blood because God's Word, not human faith, establish the presence). The *Explanation* advocated following Melanchthon rather than Luther in formulating the doctrine of the Lord's Supper.[83]

Soon thereafter, in April 1574, Elector August and his wife, Anna of Denmark, became convinced that some of their most trusted councilors, along with several professors at the Wittenberg, had conspired secretly to change the public teaching of his lands. His feelings of betrayal aroused a harsh reaction. Peucer, one court preacher, Christian Schütz, August's chancellor Georg Cracow, and a superintendent Johann Stössel, were jailed, where the latter two died. August's government launched a campaign to cleanse his church of "Calvinist" tendencies. A first step took place at a territorial diet in Torgau in which a new confession was composed to clarify and sharpen the intention of the

[81] Robert Kolb, "Altering the Agenda, Shifting the Strategy: The *Grundfest* of 1571 as Philippist Program for Lutheran Concord," *SCJ* 30 (1999), 705–26.
[82] Koch, "Der kursächsische Philippismus," p. 74.
[83] *Exegesis perspicua et ferme integra controversiae de sacra Coena* (Leipzig, 1574).

"Dresden Consensus". It set forth a position based on Luther's and Melanchthon's teaching in the early years of the Reformation.[84] Further steps took place under the leadership of Jakob Andreae, whom August borrowed from Württemberg to aid his own theologians in the process of re-establishing what he held to be a proper theological stance for his church. As part of that process plans for a general effort to unite opposing groups within German evangelical churches emerged, with Andreae as the key agent of concord.

The Road to Concord

Controversy had hardly broken out among Luther's and Melanchthon's followers when initial efforts to restore doctrinal unity surfaced. Two strategies governed these endeavors although proponents of each sometimes employed elements of the other. One placed responsibility for seeking concord with the princes. Its advocates, above all the Philippists, generally sought agreement on the basis of general statements on a disputed teaching and avoided condemnations of false teachings. The Gnesio-Lutherans favored theologians as agents of concord, insisted on explicit, detailed expositions of disputed points, with condemnations of both false teachings and false teachers, to prevent further confusion in the church. Duke Christoph of Württemberg initiated negotiations to end the controversies in 1552. They continued in further princely ventures, such as the Frankfurt Recess of 1558, and in conversations instigated by Gnesio-Lutherans and Philippists. Gnesio-Lutherans of Lower Saxony organized the "colloquy" of Coswig (1557), conducted by mediators who traveled between Melanchthon in Wittenberg and Flacius in Coswig, and the Colloquy of Altenburg (1568/1569), organized by the Ernestine and Albertine governments, ended in failure.

When Jakob Andreae came to Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel to aid Duke Julius in introducing the Reformation in 1568, he traveled with the assignment from Duke Christoph to seek Lutheran unity as well. His "Five Articles," on justification, good works, freedom of the will, adiaphora, and the Lord's Supper, were brief, general, and without con-

[84] Irene Dingel, "Die Torgauer Artikel (1574) als Vermittlungsversuch zwischen der Theologie Luthers und der Melanchthons," in *Praxis Pietatis. Beiträge zu Theologie und Frömmigkeit in der Frühen Neuzeit. Wolfgang Sommer zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. Hans-Jörg Nieden and Marcel Nieden (Stuttgart, 1999), pp. 119–34.

demnations, arousing criticism from Gnesio-Lutherans and enthusiasm from few others. Under his leadership a colloquy of representatives from several ministeria in Zerbst (1570) reached general agreement but failed to alter the situation. His trek through northern Germany did lead to his alienation from Wittenberg, however, when he later discovered the gulf between his own views of the Lord's Supper and that of the Wittenberg faculty. Therefore, he composed detailed expositions of justification, good works, the free will and original sin, adiaphora, the third use of the law, and Christology in sermonic form. This work, *Six Christian Sermons on the Divisons…Among Theologians of the Augsburg Confession* (1573), condemned false teaching and false teachers (for the most part in the margins) and largely supported the positions of those Gnesio-Lutherans who did not accept Flacius' doctrine of original sin.[85] His request for critique from north German colleagues brought him the suggestion that the Tübingen faculty as a whole should compose a more sophisticated form of these sermons; he instead composed the document, later dubbed the "Swabian Concord," himself. Martin Chemnitz, David Chytraeus, and others undertook revisions, called the "Swabian-Saxon Concord," which, along with a parallel effort by theologians from Baden, Henneberg, and Württemberg, the "Maulbronn Formula," served as the basis for the text of the Solid Declaration of the Formula of Concord.

Elector August and Andreae first assembled a committee of electoral Saxon theologians, including Nikolaus Selnecker, to construct the new formula for public teaching, but this group was quickly expanded to include Chemnitz, Chytraeus, and two representatives from Brandenburg, Andreas Musculus and Christoph Körner. They gathered at Torgau in May 1576 to draft that "Torgau Book". It was sent to all evangelical churches in the empire. Many offered critiques, which were considered at Bergen abbey near Magdeburg in May 1577. Reactions to the criticism were worked into the "Bergen Book," which became the Solid Declaration of the Formula of Concord. Andreae had composed an "Epitome," which summarized the Torgau Book; it was placed alongside the Bergen Book, or Solid Declaration, to comprise the Formula of Concord. Andreae also wrote a preface to the collection of documents, the Book of Concord, that embraced not only this

[85] *Sechs Christlicher Predig/Von den Spaltungen/so sich zwischen den Theologen Augsburgischer Confession…erhaben…* (Tübingen, 1573).

Formula but also the Augsburg Confession, its Apology, Luther's two catechisms, and his Smalcald Articles, with Melanchthon's Treatise on the Power and Primacy of the People attached. This preface explained the Formula and Book of Concord in historical context; it was written to win support from Elector Ludwig VI of the Palatinate, who had succeeded his Calvinistic father, Frederick III, in 1576, and was gently guiding his lands in a Lutheran direction. After a long period of hesitation Ludwig joined the electors of Brandenburg and Saxony in accepting the Formula and Book of Concord.[86] A campaign to win support for the Book visited most Evangelical territories and enlisted the acceptance of roughly two-thirds of the evangelical churches in Germany.

Opposition to the Book of Concord remained among some disciples of Melanchthon, who believed his insights were being discarded; among those in the Wittenberg circle who were indeed drifting in a Calvinist direction; and among some adherents of Flacius' doctrine of original sin.[87] A defense of its teachings on the Lord's Supper, Christology, and original sin, and of its regard for the secondary authority of the Augsburg Confession and its dependence on Luther, appeared in 1583, the *Apology of the Book of Concord*, composed by Chemnitz, Selnecker, and Ludwig's representative, Timotheus Kirchner.[88]

The Formula of Concord represents the tireless efforts of Jakob Andreae at ecclesiastical diplomacy and the insightful search for a consensus that honored the concerns of the disputing parties in so far as that was possible with a presentation of Luther's and Melanchthon's teaching as the Concordists understood it. With Andreae, Martin Chemnitz and David Chytraeus strove to preserve Luther's and Melanchthon's insights according to their interpretation and applied them to the issues and questions of their day. This settlement dictated major categories of Lutheran interpretation of reality and served as the standard for public

[86] The Book is published as BSLK, English translation, BC; the Formula is found BSLK; pp. 736–1135; BC, pp. 486–660. Cf. Irene Dingel, "Evangelische Lehr- und Bekenntnisbildung im Spiegel der innerprotestantischen Auseinandersetzungen zur Zeit des Augsburger Religionsfriedens," in *Als Frieden möglich war. 450 Jahre Augsburger Religionsfrieden*, ed. Carl A. Hoffmann et al. (Regensburg, 2005), pp. 51–61. On its preface, see idem, "The Preface of The Book of Concord as a Reflection of Sixteenth-Century Confessional Development," LQ 15 (2001), 373–95.

[87] Dingel, *Concordia*, passim.

[88] Ibid., pp. 603–85.

teaching as well as a tool of instruction for most Lutheran churches throughout the seventeenth century and down to the present time.

Toward Further Research

Although this essay has not cited all the secondary literature available, its notes indicate accurately that large gaps still exist in the study of the culture of controversy that shaped Lutheran teaching in the period of maturation in the second half of the 16th century. Further research will profit from a website constructed in connection with the edition of selected publications from these controversies, "Controversia et confessio. Quellenedition zur Bekenntnisbildung und Konfessionalisierung (1548–1580)," http://www.litdb.evtheol.uni-mainz.de/datenbank.index_front.php. It provides bibliographical descriptions of some 1,500 publications from the period with brief summaries of the contents of each, categorized by author, controversy, place of publication, and printers. Short biographies of authors are also available at this website to facilitate study of the individuals and groups involved. The edition of texts in eight volumes, covering the Interim, adiaphoristic, Majoristic, synergistic, antinomian, Osiandrian controversies as well as those over original sin and the Lord's Supper and Christology, are scheduled to be issued between 2008 and 2022.[89] These volumes are designed to enable students access to the chief publications of each controversy.

[89] Director of the project is Irene Dingel, under the auspices of the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft and the Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur Mainz.

ACADEMIC LIFE AND TEACHING IN POST-REFORMATION LUTHERANISM

Kenneth G. Appold

Students of early-modern Lutheran university history are faced with a paradox. On the one hand, they have heard that the Reformation brought about an overhauling of universities that was designed to liberate those institutions from papal control and to overcome "scholastic" patterns of learning. On the other hand, they frequently see post-Reformation Lutheran universities, the very institutions which should have profited from those reforms, portrayed as stagnant and restrictive seats of Protestant "scholasticism". If such a view is accurate, then the Reformation did not bring about a durable increase in intellectual creativity and academic freedom but instead led to something of the opposite.

Apologists of the Reformation-era reforms have long sought to resolve this paradox by fashioning a streamlined narrative of university history that begins with accounts of late-medieval decline, counteracted by the rise of humanism and climaxing with the reforms carried out by Martin Luther and Philipp Melanchthon. This age of glory is then followed by a darker period marked by stagnation, intellectual conservatism, and a relapse into pre-Reformation patterns.[1] The search for culprits tends to focus on post-Reformation university theologians, often described as epigones and narrow-minded confessionalists who squandered the gifts left by their predecessors and turned the heady age of reform into a grinding machinery of institutionalization and dogmatism. Fortunately for Lutherans, such writers continue, Pietism (and later the Enlightenment) arrived on the scene, exposed Orthodoxy for what it was, and took up the banner of reform anew.

Those traditional accounts of early Lutheranism are conveniently aerodynamic, gliding through large swaths of history unimpeded by the

[1] A similar timeline is presented—not uncritically—by Lewis Spitz, "The Importance of the Reformation for the Universities: Culture and Confessions in the Critical Years," in *Rebirth, Reform and Resilience. Universities in Transition 1300–1700*, ed. James M. Kittelson and Pamela J. Transue (Columbus, 1984), pp. 42–67; 43–44.

discovery of facts that might contradict their historiographic agenda. Like most constructs, however, they tend to rust over time. Research results of recent decades have rendered the older accounts largely untenable and have prompted a thoroughgoing reassessment of early Lutheran history. A good deal of that research has focused on the history of universities[2] and has reopened the paradox mentioned at the outset: If the Reformation reformed the universities, then why does early-modern university life seem so desultory?

As the following pages argue, the very perception of such a paradox rests on a misapprehension of the nature of early-modern university reform. While the Reformation—together with late-medieval humanism—brought significant changes to the university curriculum, particularly in Protestant areas, it did not cause the structural changes that marked the shift from a medieval to a modern university. It was merely one of the catalysts. Some historians have made this point more emphatically, arguing that university history largely resists attempts to apply the periodization of general history. Since the kinds of specific changes that affected church and state during the Reformation had little comparable impact on the institutional character of university life, it makes only limited sense to speak of "Reformation-era universities", or, for that matter, of "universities in the Age of Confessionalization".[3] Structural change came more slowly to Europe's universities; when it

---

[2] Much of the recent research into university history is fueled by a steady stream of anniversary celebrations in Germany, such as those that marked 500 years of the University of Tübingen in 1977, 600 years of Heidelberg in 1986, 500 years of Halle-Wittenberg in 2002, 500 years of Frankfurt/Oder in 2006, and the upcoming 600th anniversary of the University of Leipzig in 2009, among others. A bibliographical overview, focusing on the history of theological faculties, is provided by Andreas Gößner, "Die Geschichte von theologischen Fakultäten als wissenschaftlicher Gegenstand. Ein Literaturbericht," in *Die Theologische Fakultät der Universität Leipzig. Personen, Profile und Perspektiven aus sechs Jahrhunderten Fakultätsgeschichte*, ed. A. Gößner (Leipzig, 2005), pp. 17–38. A useful cross-section of historical studies is contained in *Zwischen Wissenschaft und Politik. Studien zur deutschen Universitätsgeschichte. Festschrift für Eike Wolgast zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Armin Kohnle and Frank Engehausen (Stuttgart, 2001). Recent monographs include Thomas Kaufmann, *Universität und lutherische Konfessionalisierung. Die Rostocker Theologieprofessoren und ihr Beitrag zur theologischen Bildung und kirchlichen Gestaltung im Herzogtum Mecklenburg zwischen 1550 und 1675* (Gütersloh, 1997); Michael Höhle, *Universität und Reformation. Die Universität Frankfurt (Oder) von 1506 bis 1550* (Cologne, 2002); and Kenneth G. Appold, *Orthodoxie als Konsensbildung. Das Disputationswesen an der Universität Wittenberg zwischen 1570 und 1710* (Tübingen, 2004).

[3] German historian Peter Baumgart particularly emphasizes this point in "Universitätsgründungen im konfessionellen Zeitalter: Würzburg und Helmstedt," in *Beiträge zu Problemen deutscher Universitätsgründungen der frühen Neuzeit*, ed. Peter Baumgart and Notker Hammerstein (Nendeln, Liechtenstein, 1978), pp. 191–215. Also idem, "Uni-

did, it tended to affect all of them, regardless of confessional profile, in similar—albeit not identical—ways. The developments that came to characterize sixteenth and seventeenth-century university life were set in motion many decades before the Reformation. They had more to do with the long-term rise of national and territorial hegemonies than with specific religious agendas. In other words, university reform owed a significant part of its profile and momentum to political, rather than theological, changes. Some of those developments were convenient to the Reformation and aided its propagation; in fact, one could argue that they were a significant cause of its success. But others turned out to be less salutary in the long-run and may in fact have damaged the Reformation's legacy.

At the very least, the political context within which early-modern university life emerged provided a stage upon which learning unfolded, was judged, and against whose boundaries it reacted. At the risk of overstretching the metaphor, one may also say that this stage necessitated a curtain, behind which some of the more interesting intellectual developments of the day took place. In other words, political pressures of the time caused there to be much more to post-Reformation academic life than readily meets the eye. That is particularly true for those aspects that did not fit easily into the political program and therefore remained less prominent or even concealed. Part of the aim of this essay lies in pulling the curtain aside to reveal some of those "countercultural" trends of early-modern higher learning. Doing so shows that universities in this era were far from stagnant or reactionary; many were vital and creative sites of significant scholarship. At least some of that creativity, however, was spent in negotiating the political terrain of the day. How they met the demands of their *Landesherren* and at the same time sought to assert their academic dignity and preserve their intellectual freedom is what gives this history its special dynamic. Significantly, it is a story that does not begin and end with the lives of the reformers but starts before they were born and reveals its plotline most fully in the century after their deaths.

This essay presents a history of post-Reformation Lutheran university life and teaching, focusing on the period from Melanchthon's death (1560) to the end of the 17th century. Since many of the patterns

---

versitätsautonomie und landesherrliche Gewalt im späten 16. Jahrhundert," *Zeitschrift für Historische Forschung* 1 (1974), 23–53.

that shaped this period originated in a late-medieval shift in university culture, the chapter begins with a look back at these macro-historical trends. While previous efforts to portray early-modern Lutheran university culture have focused either on its material history or its intellectual history, the present approach regards the two as inextricably related and strives toward a more integrative view.[4] Needless to say, the chapter cannot give an exhaustive account of this period; many interesting and significant factors will need to remain untreated. Nonetheless, the author hopes that this overview will provide both a useful introduction and a fresh perspective on this exciting period of early Lutheran history.

Academic Life in the Early-Modern State

The Emergence of Early-Modern Universities

A significant change in how universities are established took place in the 14th century. Older European universities, such as Paris, Bologna, Oxford, and Cambridge, arose more or less informally around centers of learning and only gradually acquired their legal and institutional framework.[5] They are often described as *universitates ex consuetudine* because they came to be universities by force of custom and tradition. During the 14th century a new type of university began to appear: institutions that were founded deliberately by sovereigns, city magistrates, or popes. Because the papacy, which had played a leading role in organizing the older universities, now found itself diminished by schism, kings and territorial rulers increasingly took the initiative in establishing their own sites of higher learning though prior to the Reformation they invariably sought papal approval and support for their actions.[6] Since

[4] This approach is outlined in the introduction to Appold, *Orthodoxie*, pp. 5–6, and implemented in that work.

[5] Paris emerged from local cathedral schools that had flourished in the city for roughly two centuries before adopting a university statute in 1215. Bologna took shape around a core of schools for civil and canon law, at least one of which had been founded as early as 1088, but which only came together as a university during the 12th century. Oxford, which grew in part from returning 12th-century Parisian expatriates, adopted its statutes in 1253.

[6] Rulers typically sent a petition to Rome, asking the pope to grant the university privileges, legal recognition and teaching licenses. Cf. Rainer A. Müller, *Geschichte der Universität. Von der mittelalterlichen Universitas zur deutschen Hochschule* (Munich, 1990), pp. 13–14.

these new universities were granted "privileges" (often involving legal exemptions and a certain degree of self-governance), they are generally known as *universitates ex privilegio*. In time this new type would change the face of higher learning throughout Europe, ushering in a university culture that was—particularly in Germany—markedly less monastic and ecclesial, considerably more secular and state-oriented.[7] As rulers began to recognize the benefits and prestige afforded by having "one's own" university, the rate of new foundations accelerated rapidly. New universities in central and northern Europe came to include:[8]

Universities	Year of foundation
Prague	1348
Cracow	1364
Vienna	1365
Heidelberg	1385
Cologne	1388
Buda	1389
Erfurt	1392
Würzburg	1402 (closed 1413, reopened 1582)
Leipzig	1409
Rostock	1419
Leuven	1425
Greifswald	1456
Freiburg	1456
Basel	1460
Bratislava	1467
Ingolstadt	1472
Trier	1453/1473
Mainz	1476
Tübingen	1477
Uppsala	1477

[7] For more on these developments, cf. *A History of the University in Europe*, ed. Walter Rüegg; vol. 1: *Universities in the Middle Ages*, ed. Hilde de Ridder-Symoens (Cambridge, 1992); vol. 2: *Universities in Early Modern Europe (1500–1800)*, ed. Hilde de Ridder-Symoens (Cambridge, 1996); vol. 3: *Universities in the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries (1800–1945)*, ed. Walter Rüegg (Cambridge, 2004). Cf. also the dated, but still valuable work of Friedrich Paulsen, *Geschichte des gelehrten Unterrichts auf den deutschen Schulen und Universitäten von Ausgang des Mittelalters bis zur Gegenwart*…, 3d ed., 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1919).

[8] Most of this information was taken from Müller, *Geschichte*, but is readily available elsewhere. These dates represent the point at which an institution was founded *as a university*. Many existed earlier in some other institutional form, such as the University of Strasbourg, founded in 1538 as a gymnasium, privileged as an academy in 1566, and expanded to a full university in 1621.

Table (*cont.*)

Universities	Year of foundation
Copenhagen	1478
Wittenberg	1502
Frankfurt (Oder)	1506
Marburg	1527
Königsberg	1544
Dillingen	1549
Jena	1558
Leiden	1575
Helmstedt	1576
Altdorf	1578
Herborn	1584
Graz	1586
Gießen	1607
Paderborn	1615
Rinteln	1620
Strasbourg	1621
Salzburg	1623
Osnabrück	1630
Dorpat (Tartu)	1632
Bamberg	1648
Duisburg	1655
Kiel	1665
Lund	1668/1682
Innsbruck	1675
Halle	1694

In general, these "new" universities moved away from the quasi-monastic culture of the older medieval institutions and toward something as yet undefined, but at any rate more public and secular. Some of the changes were external and involved factors such as student accommodation and university administration; others affected the curriculum, as well as the social background of professors and students.

Changes in student accommodation were one of the more visible factors accompanying—and facilitating—the universities' drift toward modernity. While older universities such as Paris and, more famously, Oxford and Cambridge, had housed its students in colleges, where they lived in a relatively closed scholastic community, newer universities lacked the resources and inclination to implement a collegial system large-scale. Aside from a few notable exceptions like the Tübingen *Stift*, the Heidelberg *Sapienz*, or dormitory halls for scholarship students

like the late-sixteenth-century Wittenberg *Augusteum*, students at newer universities typically rented private rooms in town.[9] For better or worse, that custom integrated them into the life of their urban settings far more thoroughly than had been the case in the cloistered confines of medieval colleges. The result was an increasingly worldly student culture, a trend that, on one level, went hand-in-hand with the public-service ideals of the new university's founding sovereigns.[10]

Universities' financial and administrative structures also changed as they approached the early-modern era. Put rather simply, they moved from depending on the pope to depending on their local sovereigns. As time would tell, this was not always an improvement. Medieval popes not only bestowed teaching privileges on universities; they also aided the institutions and their professors financially through the church's extensive network of resources. That was particularly true where popes gave universities use of church-owned buildings and prebends. It further applied to the recruitment of faculty members, many of whom were drawn from religious orders or the clergy and had to be released from their commissions by the pope. Popes also influenced what was taught and who taught, in some cases intervening directly, as in 1256, when Pope Alexander IV forced the University of Paris to accept members of mendicant orders into the faculty, in other cases by means of their influence on synods or local church authorities, or, more rarely, by their right to convene councils, where controversial teachings could be examined. The church also maintained an institutional presence in medieval universities through the office of chancellor.[11] Chancellors, typically bishops or their representatives, exercised a supervisory function over the university and monitored teaching, thereby giving the church a means of exercising influence over the university's internal

[9] While some late-medieval and early-modern universities included dormitory-like *Bursen*, these tended to be "off-campus" and were far removed in spirit from the nearly autonomous college structures of, for example, Oxford or Cambridge.

[10] For one such ideal, see Frederick the Wise's statements at the founding of Wittenberg University in 1502, below.

[11] The chancellor's office owes its origins to a Parisian tradition, by which the local bishop was asked by the king to exercise legal jurisdiction over the university's members, including its students. That gave the university a privileged legal status and a degree of freedom from secular authorities. It restricted the university's autonomy, however, by giving the church an office of direct influence in its academic affairs. Notable exceptions to this practice were the English universities, Oxford and Cambridge, whose chancellors were elected by the faculty, from whose ranks they tended to be taken. Cf. Müller, *Geschichte*, pp. 23–24.

affairs. Nonetheless, most universities remained largely self-administered, usually by means of an elected council or senate, taken from members of the faculty, and a chief administrative officer, or rector, commonly elected every semester and also part of the faculty. Generally speaking, these structures remained superficially unchanged by the transition into the early-modern period. As state sources of income began to replace those of the church, however, dependency on external powers almost always increased. For one thing, local or territorial rulers had fewer resources at their disposal than the internationally organized church, and university finances frequently had to be taken out of running state budgets. Secondly, political sovereigns rarely reduced the instruments of external supervision available to the church; many increased them. Princes as often as not sought to impose their own agendas on "their" universities. Because they were closer at hand than the pope, they were able to do this much more effectively. All in all, most European universities of the early-modern period probably enjoyed less financial and administrative autonomy than their medieval predecessors.[12]

Internally, the newer universities were affected most profoundly by two factors: the rise of humanism and the pragmatic utilitarianism of their rulers. Frequently, the two went hand in hand. Significantly, both were external forces rather than originating within the universities, and set in motion a long-term process of adjustment and assimilation.

Humanism arose in northern Italy during the 14th century around figures such as the poet and historian Francesco Petrarca, and only slowly worked its way across the Alps, arriving in Germany during the 15th and early 16th centuries. Cultivating an ideal of learned eloquence that drew inspiration from classical antiquity, humanists promoted the study of language and literature. Their educational programs emphasized the medieval *trivium* of grammar, rhetoric, and dialectic, as well as the recovery of classical source texts, with the goal of teaching their students to speak wisely and well. Despite certain areas of continuity with scholastic traditions, most humanists saw themselves as proponents of something new. Frequent tracts and poems satirized both the old order's representatives, such as clergy and scholars, and its intellectual traditions, particularly those involving text-commentaries and aristotelian philosophy. By the time humanism began to influence German universities, it did so most visibly by refocusing and expanding *artes* studies,

[12] Examples of how Lutheran rulers exercised control over their universities follow.

or "philosophy". While traditional courses in physics, metaphysics, and logic were retained, they were now supplemented by a greater emphasis on the art of language. That meant more courses in grammar, dialectic, and especially rhetoric, but also more languages, most famously Greek and Hebrew. Courses that used scholastic textbooks were replaced by those that drew on classical sources. That trend became particularly significant when applied to the study of the Bible since its back-to-the-sources approach undermined medieval authorities and opened new avenues of exegesis. Beyond these curricular ramifications humanism also exercised a broader cultural influence. It embodied something of an ethos, calling for learned eloquence as a basic attitude and way of life, even imbuing that ideal with religious significance: *eloquens atque sapiens pietas*, a faith both eloquent and wise, became a widely espoused goal of humanist education.

There seems, at first glance, little intrinsic reason why early-modern sovereigns should have chosen to promote humanist educational reform. When they did, their motives were often incidental to the contents of humanist thought. Early-modern sovereigns like Saxon Elector Frederick III sought educational institutions that would produce graduates who, more than anything, were useful to society. That usefulness was most interesting when it aided the court. If this meant producing an effective leadership class, then humanism's cultivation of skillful communication—eloquence—might help. Sovereigns were probably more attracted to some of humanism's secondary characteristics, however. Many were lodged in the humanists' spirit of innovation. For example, humanism's reputation for being modern and cutting-edge (which it still was in 16th-century Germany) appealed to rulers who sought to afford their universities a competitive advantage in an increasingly crowded "market-place" of higher education. Tellingly, this was precisely the case Wittenberg's professors made to their elector as they lobbied him to authorize a humanist-style curricular reform in 1516: doing so was the way to set Wittenberg apart from backward places like Greifswald, Mainz, Trier, and Basel, which remained mired in clerical traditionalism.[13] Frederick acceded and called a young scholar named Philip

[13] Cf. *Urkundenbuch der Universität Wittenberg, Teil 1 (1502–1611)*, ed. Walter Friedensburg (Magdeburg, 1926) p. 75. For a recent account of the reforms that took place in Wittenberg between 1518 and 1521, cf. Jens-Martin Kruse, *Universitätstheologie und Kirchenreform. Die Anfänge der Reformation in Wittenberg 1516–1522* (Mainz, 2002), pp. 139–53.

Melanchthon to the faculty of arts. Beyond keeping their universities competitive and current, rulers may have found another aspect of humanism's innovative spirit appealing as well. To the extent that it promoted a break with medieval scholastic traditions and frequently with the ecclesial authorities that defended those traditions, humanism helped destabilize the old corporate-clerical order and thereby increased the secular rulers' means of influence.[14] That point also shimmers between the lines in the Wittenberg professors' above-mentioned letter. Finally, there were social factors that aided humanism's growth, particularly in urban contexts. Imperial cities such as Strasbourg and Nuremberg were increasingly dominated by an urban bourgeoisie that to a large extent adopted a humanist ethos. As magistrates in those cities founded institutions of higher education, they did so in a humanist spirit. Their actions were as much the product of programmatic convictions as they were symptoms of a more fundamental social phenomenon: the rise to prominence and power of an educated urban bourgeoisie (*städtisches Bürgertum*).[15]

Finally, new universities of the early-modern era differed from medieval institutions demographically. Most obviously, their move away from clerical dominance meant that their professors were increasingly lay people—and married. This second factor had an enormous social significance, particularly in Protestant territories, where even those professors who were clergy could marry. It launched a new social group, the academic dynasty. While this phenomenon has rarely been examined statistically,[16] it is clear that a sizeable proportion of university professors (by some accounts well more than half) came from academic households whose heads were either professors themselves or high-ranking public servants. By extension, professors' sons tended to find positions in universities, churches, or courts, yielding a network of familial relations that exercised a sizeable influence throughout early-

[14] Paulsen advanced this view vigorously, *Geschichte* 1:53–150, echoed by Müller, *Geschichte*, pp. 48–50.

[15] Cf. Anton Schindling, "Straßburg und Altdorf—Zwei humanistische Hochschulgründungen von evangelischen freien Reichsstädten," in *Beiträge zu Problemen*, pp. 149–89.

[16] An interesting exception is Hermann Niebuhr, *Zur Sozialgeschichte der Marburger Professoren 1653–1806* (Darmstadt/Marburg, 1983).

modern Germany.[17] In terms of social influence, if not outright prestige or income, academics represented a class akin to the nobility.

As early-modern universities grew more territorially-centered, they naturally became less international. The more celebrated institutions continued to draw both faculty and students from outside their homeland, but even universities like Wittenberg, where students from across Europe, particularly to the North and East, continued to study, were a far cry from, for example, medieval Paris.[18] This trend toward provincialism was exacerbated by confessionalization. Rulers not infrequently imposed restrictions upon their subjects' educational mobility, recommending confessionally "appropriate" institutions and forbidding students from attending universities deemed unacceptable. That was even the case within Protestantism, as, for example, Frederick William, elector of Brandenburg and adherent of the Reformed confession, prohibited his subjects from studying in Wittenberg (1662). Despite these factors, though, early-modern universities were not culturally homogeneous. The fact that courses were still held in Latin meant that students from all over Europe and even, in very few cases, from Africa and Asia, could take part. Matriculation lists show that many did so. The custom of *peregrinatio*, whereby students spent a year studying abroad, further promoted exchange; *Landesherren* even issued scholarships for study at approved institutions in other lands.[19] Nonetheless, the majority of an early-modern student body hailed from the university's own home territory.

The Reformation and University Reform

Significantly, nearly all the above-mentioned changes that marked the transition from medieval to early-modern university life began prior to

[17] This development was intensified by other forms of class-specific propagation, as well. Professors frequently gave their daughters' hand in marriage to a colleague; professors' widows married other professors. Such trends were even more pronounced among Protestant pastors.

[18] One symptom of the trend toward provincialism lies in the fate of the so-called "nations," inner-university organizations of students grouped according to home country. Prominent in medieval university life, they gradually disappeared during the 15th and 16th centuries, largely for lack of demand.

[19] On the confessional politics of scholarship aid, cf. Andreas Gößner, *Die Studenten an der Universität Wittenberg. Studien zur Kulturgeschichte des studentischen Alltags und zum Stipendienwesen in der zweiten Hälfte des 16. Jahrhunderts* (Leipzig, 2003), pp. 28–31, 70–90.

the Reformation. Some were abetted by the Reformation, but, with the exception of married clergy among faculties, most could have taken place independently of it. At the same time the Reformation did have an important impact on university life, and several of its most significant contributions need to be recapitulated. The University of Wittenberg shall serve as an example, both because its reforms are well-documented and because, as the institution from which the Lutheran Reformation was launched, it served as a model for many of its contemporaries.

When Frederick III founded the University of Wittenberg in 1502, he did so with the commonweal in mind. This was to be an institution that served the needs of Frederick's subjects and educated the more talented among them to benefit their society.[20] Reading Frederick's words as he announced the new university's foundation, one is struck by their matter-of-fact, pragmatic tone. We hear no high-blown oratory on new ideals of education, just a down-to-earth identification of the problem (namely, many people in his land wanting higher education and no place for them to get it after the division of Saxony, which placed rival university Leipzig outside the electoral domains) and its solution (a new university). Nothing in his words conveys the sense that this is a particularly auspicious occasion: Frederick might as well have been inaugurating a new hospital or grain silo. And yet it was. The Saxon elector's pragmatism, his attention to his subjects' needs, and his direction of the university to that end, all speak for a new age. This was not to be an institution geared first and foremost to serving the church but one aimed at furthering society (and using the church to that purpose).

Interestingly, Frederick had his plans authorized first by Emperor Maximilian and waited nearly five years before securing papal approval for the new university.[21] Whether this was a deliberately anti-clerical gesture is hard to say. After all, Frederick had from the very beginning

[20] Frederick's announcement of the university's foundation from 24 August 1502, printed in Friedensburg, *Urkundenbuch* 1:3–4: "Nachdem wier betrachten und bewegen, das viel leute und personen sind vom adel und anderen stenden, die zü lernen lieb und neigung haben, auch darzü geschickt erfunden werden, aber des durch unfleiß und mangel güter und gelerter meister verhindert und geseumpt, darumb wier fürgenommen, gott dem almechtigen zü lobe, gemeinem nütz und unsern underthanen und anderen zü fürderung etlich gelerte personen, doctores und meister in unsser stat Wittenberg… zü bestellen". (4). For a narrative account of Wittenberg's history, cf. Walter Friedensburg, *Geschichte der Universität Wittenberg* (Halle, 1917).

[21] 20 June 1507, Friedensburg, *Urkundenbuch* 1:17.

enlisted ecclesial support by contacting the bishop in whose jurisdiction Wittenberg lay. Still, his rather casual attitude toward papal authorization says something about both his political priorities and his educational vision; Frederick was planning a local *Landesuniversität*, rather than an Oxford or Paris. In retrospect, the circumstances surrounding the Wittenberg university's foundation appear as a sign of changing times. While earlier universities received their privileges exclusively from the pope, they increasingly sought additional confirmation from the emperor. In Germany the University of Greifswald had already followed this dual approach at its founding in 1456. Tübingen also sought imperial confirmation of its papal privileges.[22] At its founding Wittenberg followed suit—albeit asking the emperor first and the pope later. Universities founded by Protestants during the Reformation dispensed with papal approval altogether and, as in the case of Marburg in 1527, at times even with that of the emperor.

Luther and the other reformers welcomed this trend. Tellingly, one of Luther's most significant early writings on university reform came in an appeal *To the Christian Nobility of the German Nation* (1520),[23] that is, to local sovereigns. "The universities need a good and thorough reformation", Luther tells the worldly rulers. Why? Because "[e]verything the papacy has instituted and ordered serves only to increase sin and error".[24] The steps Luther goes on to delineate are fairly vague when compared to the more specific recommendations he and his Wittenberg colleagues communicated to their own elector,[25] but the main point is clear enough: any reform of higher education will require the ruling class to wrest control of the universities from papal authority. Doing so will open the door to the more material reforms Luther had in mind, including the abolition of Aristotle's *Physics*, *Metaphysics*, *De Anima*, and *Ethics*, canon law, commentaries on the Bible and the Sentences—all to make way for an intensified focus on Holy Scripture itself: "the Scripture alone is our vineyard in which we must all labor and toil".[26] In order to facilitate such study, Luther argued for the inclusion of Greek and

[22] The University of Tübingen received papal privileges in 1476, imperial confirmation in 1484.

[23] Martin Luther, *An den christlichen Adel deutscher Nation von des christlichen Standes Besserung*, WA 6:404–469; LW 44:123–217.

[24] LW 44:200.

[25] Cf. Kruse, *Universitätstheologie*, pp. 139–53.

[26] LW 44:205.

Hebrew (as had already happened in Wittenberg by this time).[27] Higher education should be directed toward strengthening faith and cultivating piety. In making this case, he was not far from the humanist ethos, and in fact took up some of the humanistically colored recommendations Melanchthon had made in his address "De corrigendis adulescentiae studiis" in 1518,[28] such as the emphasis on language and the insertion of history into the curriculum.[29] Yet Luther aimed more squarely at a biblically-based student formation, an improvement of character that came as the specific result of learning to understand the gospel.[30] In that sense he was arguing to the nobility that a proper reform of the universities at their hands would raise up a generation of pious and virtuous citizens. In this as in other writings on education, Luther blended spiritual and worldly interests resolutely.[31] Education, as much as anywhere else in Luther's thought, is an area where the two-realms distinction dare not be understood as a separation of faith and daily life. Stronger faith makes better subjects—a point that would not have been lost on the noble readers. In this regard Luther's educational aims coincided in important ways with the interests of the ruling class.

Many of the material reforms stipulated by Wittenberg faculty members were, in fact, implemented in Wittenberg. Other German universities located in areas sympathetic to the cause followed suit in time though many held on to their conservative and largely anti-humanist stance for decades. The most significant formal aspect of the Wittenberg reform-agenda, the call to guard the universities from ecclesial influence and place them under the aegis of political rulers, gradually became

---

[27] LW 44:200–07.

[28] CR 11:15–25.

[29] On Melanchthon's address, which he held as his introductory lecture upon arriving in Wittenberg, cf. Kruse, *Universitätstheologie*, pp. 144–48.

[30] Luther's criticism of the universities establishes a strong connection between study of Scripture, strengthening of faith, and the formation of a virtuous character: "What are [the universities] but places where loose living is practiced, where little is taught of the Holy Scriptures and Christian faith, and where only the blind, heathen teacher Aristotle rules far more than Christ" (LW 44:200). His closing words, too, are illuminating on this point: "The universities only ought to turn out men who are experts in the Holy Scriptures, men who can become bishops and priests, and stand in the front line against heretics, the devil, and all the world. But where do you find that? I greatly fear that the universities, unless they teach the Holy Scriptures diligently and impress them on the young students, are wide gates to hell" (ibid., p. 7).

[31] On the convergence of worldly and spiritual interests in Luther's writings on education, cf. Markus Wriedt, "Die theologische Begründung der Bildungsreform bei Luther und Melanchthon," in *Humanismus und Wittenberger Reformation*, ed. Michael Beyer and Günther Wartenberg (Leipzig, 1996), pp. 155–83.

a reality as well. The quickest response to Luther's 1520 appeal came from Landgrave Philipp of Hesse, who managed to create an entirely new university by 1527, the University of Marburg. Wittenberg was reconfigured structurally and financially as a state institution by Elector John Frederick I, nephew of Frederick the Wise, in 1536; Tübingen was similarly reformed in 1535–1538; Greifswald in 1539. A slow-moving reform of Leipzig's university began in the same year and took through the mid-1540s to complete; Heidelberg was given new statutes in 1558; Rostock in 1563. By this time Wittenberg's university had already been closed for a brief period following the Smalcald War, in 1547–1548. Following the region's transfer from Ernestine to Albertine Saxony as a consequence of the Smalcald War, John Frederick I took some of the faculty and many of the books to Jena, founding a new institution in 1548. The Albertine line, personified by Moritz, Elector of Saxony, was persuaded to retain Wittenberg, in part by Melanchthon's decision to remain there, and so the university was reopened, albeit under new territorial auspices.

Post-Reformation Universities and the State

Territorial rulers began to exercise increasing control over the educational agenda. In the early years of the Reformation reform-minded scholars welcomed that development, particularly in states where the confessional interests between academics and rulers coincided. Luther's letter to the German nobility of 1520 reveals interests that would have fit in quite well with those of the ruling nobility in most Protestant territories. These rulers sought institutions that would feed their growing needs for skilled public servants and, increasingly, desired some form of personal control over the product. An illustrative, and by no means unique, example comes with the Saxon Elector John Frederick's 1536 decision to require all clergy seeking appointment in his lands to first pass an examination at the University of Wittenberg.[32] Doing so ruffled few feathers at that institution because it happened to coincide with

[32] The examination process later yielded one of Melanchthon's most significant writings, the *Examen ordinandorum* (CR 23:1–102), first published in 1552 and revised continually by the author during the final years of his life. The text provided the basis upon which prospective ordinands were examined. Cf. Irene Dingel, "Philipp Melanchthon and the Establishment of Confessional Norms," in *LQ* 20 (2006), 146–169.

the reformers' own interests in standardizing ordination procedures and raising the educational bar for prospective pastors.

That cozy convergence of academic and political interests began to chill as the age of confessionalization set in. During this period early-modern Europe, and Germany in particular, accelerated its transition from the local and individual polities that characterized the medieval age to territorial, collective forms of administration that were centered strongly in a regional or national court—in Germany the court of the *Landesherr*.[33] To further their consolidation of power, territorial rulers introduced a variety of measures designed to render their subjects as uniform and compliant as possible. The establishment of territorially circumscribed confessional identities was part of the process of imposed conformism. Universities, as instruments of education, were, in the eyes of such rulers, wonderfully suited to advancing the aims of confessionalization. For one thing, they produced clergy, lawyers, public officials, and teachers who were useful for molding society in an encompassing way, from the top down. For another, the writing and teaching of university faculty members helped shape public opinion. Of course, universities could only be useful—in the narrow sense imagined by politicians—if they could be regulated properly and their discourse controlled. For reasons not entirely anticipated by the ruling class, that proved hard to do.

Early Lutheranism seemed disinclined toward conformism. If anything, it was remarkably contentious. In the wake of the Augsburg Interim and the electoral Saxon policy of compromise with the emperor that followed in 1548 and 1549, a series of bitterly-fought theological controversies took place, leading to the Formula of Concord, events described in Irene Dingel's essay above. This invited energetic intervention of the princes, whose authority over universities now had an additional dimension: the Peace of Augsburg (1555) had elevated them to the status of *summus episcopus* in, and given them custody of, their territorial churches. The turmoil of those years left a lasting imprint on university life in early-modern Lutheranism, though. For one thing,

[33] Cf. the introduction of this volume, pages 2–6, and Heinz Schilling, "Die Konfessionalisierung von Kirche, Staat und Gesellschaft: Profil, Leistung, Defizite und Perspektiven eines geschichtswissenschaftliches Paradigmas", in *Die katholische Konfessionalisierung*, ed. Wolfgang Reinhard and Heinz Schilling (Gütersloh, 1995). For discussion on the limits of the confessionalization paradigm's usefulness, cf. the essays collected in *Interkonfessionalität, Transkonfessionalität, binnenkonfessionelle Pluralität. Neue Forschungen zur Konfessionalisierungsthese*, ed. Kaspar von Greyerz et al. (Gütersloh, 2003).

it strengthened the resolve of *Landesherren* to take a more "hands-on" approach to exercising control over their universities and, secondly, it left administrative structures in place by which they could more effectively do just that, long after this immediate crisis had passed.

State Control and Theological Consensus-Building

State control of universities intensified during the period that preceded and coincided with the Formula of Concord's ratification. For this period the case of electoral Saxony is particularly interesting and illustrates some of the ways in which princes imposed their control over universities.

One of the implications of the inner-Lutheran controversies of the 1560s and 1570s had to do with how Lutherans related to Calvinists. This was a sensitive issue. Unlike Lutherans, Calvinists were not protected by the provisions of the Peace of Augsburg, and many Lutherans of the period felt that to be just as well. Theological differences between the two major streams of Protestantism focused above all on diverging doctrines of Christ's presence at the Eucharist, but there was also a considerable clash of religious cultures that accentuated the sense that these two confessions were competitors rather than brethren. Moderate Lutherans of the melanchthonian mold—the "Philippists"—were thought too sympathetic to Calvinism by Gnesio-lutherans. For a variety of personal and political reasons Elector August I of Saxony harbored a strong aversion to Calvinism. This rendered him suspicious of the Philippists, as well. In 1574, having intercepted letters that appeared to incriminate Saxony's academic theologians as "Crypto-Calvinists,"[34] August swept down on his universities with a vengeance. Hauling virtually the entire faculties of theology into his court, he sought to intimidate the professors into signing an anti-Philippist confession; when some refused, he fired them—and tossed some, like Christoph Pezel and his close associate, Melanchthon's protégé and son-in-law, the medical professor Caspar Peucer, into jail for good measure.[35] When August

[34] See Dingel's essay above, pp. 58–61. The term "Crypto-Calvinist" was used rather freely to describe what, at this stage at least, were more likely "Crypto-Philippists". Cf. Helmar Junghans, "Kryptocalvinisten," TRE 20: 123–29; Ernst Koch, "Der kursächsische Philippismus und seine Krise in den 1560er und 1570er Jahren,", in *Die reformierte Konfessionalisierung in Deutschland. Das Problem der „Zweiten Reformation"*, ed. Heinz Schilling (Gütersloh, 1986), pp. 60–77.

[35] On Pezel, cf. Jürgen Moltmann, *Christoph Pezel (1539–1604) und der Calvinismus in Bremen* (Bremen, 1958). On Peucer, see the essays in *Caspar Peucer (1525–1602).*

sent replacements, these were decidedly unwelcome. In Wittenberg protesting students disrupted lectures and booed the new professors; one group even threatened to set the town on fire. None of this impressed August, who, on the contrary, found his new appointments too soft on Calvinism as well. Three years later, most of them were gone. The renowned Württemberg theologian Jacob Andreae, called by August to Saxony to reconstitute the church in his lands, was assigned the task of creating some semblance of academic order at the universities in Wittenberg and Leipzig.

Arriving in Leipzig in late 1576, and in Wittenberg in early 1577, Andreae helped launch a new era in Lutheran university history, putting in place the framework for what became a Lutheran "Orthodoxy" sympathetic to, but generally more moderate than, the Gnesio-lutherans.[36] Addressing the Wittenberg faculty of theology,[37] Andreae repeatedly sounded one and the same theme: the time had come for Lutherans to reach *consensus*. It was the *sanctus consensus* of Luther and his colleagues that made the Reformation effective, and now, after a period of "perturbation," a new era of consensus was begging to dawn. Andreae outlined the institutional reforms which he felt would facilitate such consensus at the university and, in turn, make the university an instrument of consensus in Lutheran society. These included adding preaching as a third mode of instruction (next to disputations and lectures), as well as the revival of academic disputation, which had been neglected for several decades. Both points are significant. On one level, they reveal something about Andreae's epistemological convictions. As his remarks make clear, he saw consensus as something that emerged from free personal assent to theological truth, recognized intellectually through the dialogical discipline of disputation. But Andreae went further by calling for an existential grasp of that truth, as well—by encountering it as proclamation, as an *act* of speech epitomized by preaching. Humans, in his account, gain access to truth not by memorizing spoon-

Wissenschaft, Glaube und Politik im konfessionellen Zeitalter, ed. Hans-Peter Hasse and Günther Wartenberg (Leipzig, 2004).

[36] For a more detailed account of Andreae's efforts in Wittenberg in general, and of his groundbreaking lecture there, cf. Appold, *Orthodoxie*, pp. 15–25.

[37] Jacob Andreae, *Oratio de instauratione studii theologici, in Academia Witebergensi, ad eam puritatem Doctrinae coelestis, in qua, vivente D. Luthero, Doctores Sacrarum Literarum pie consenserunt, recitata Witebergae 25. Aprilis Anno 1577* (Wittenberg, 1577).

fed propositions, but actively by uttering it.[38] In that regard Andreae shows a deep regard for how individuals relate to faith and doctrine, and for the role of education in those processes. Andreae's vision of a university, as outlined here, is dominated by theological motives of mission and proclamation, resembling Luther's understanding of education as a process that promotes piety and strengthens faith. It also reveals an astute grasp of practical realities. While Lutherans may have disagreed on many matters of doctrine, they fully agreed on how doctrine should be applied: in proclamation of the gospel. A strong emphasis on homiletics could, therefore, relativize some of their quarrels and point them toward a greater common good. Andreae's understanding of disputation was nothing short of genial. Where earlier generations of theologians had disparaged disputation as something that promotes dispute, Andreae saw it as an exercise that *reconciles* disputing viewpoints—by bringing the truth to the fore and allowing both parties to be persuaded by it.[39] Andreae's was, then, what one may call a "deep" sense of consensus.

Elector August, who had sent Andreae to visit the two universities, had a more down-to-earth understanding of the term. It was dictated by force and external control. In 1580 August issued a comprehensive set of ordinances for his churches, schools and universities.[40] For the universities this meant a host of new regulations, coupled with two new supervisory offices designed to make the foreboding presence of the *Landesherr* as palpable as possible within faculty walls. The first of these was that of university chancellor. By itself a chancellor's office was not remarkable; despite the fact that it was associated with medieval papal supervision, many post-Reformation universities retained chancellors, and even Wittenberg had made use of the title in earlier years.[41] But August increased the chancellor's power massively—and

[38] Tellingly, Andreae describes theology as a practical activity: "universa Theologia practica est" (ibid., fol. E1a).

[39] Andreae departs both from Melanchthon's humanistic view of disputation as something that promotes eloquence, and from the notion, widespread during the 1560s and 1570s, that disputation breeds a contentious culture and promotes polemic. Cf. Appold, *Orthodoxie*, pp. 22–25.

[40] *Des Durchlauchtigsten/Hochgebornen Fürsten und Herrn Augusten/Hertzogen zu Sachsen…Ordnung/Wie es in seiner Churf. G. Landen/bey den Kirchen/mit der lehr und Ceremonien/deßgleichen in derselben beyden Universiteten/Consistorien/Fürsten und Particular Schulen/Visitationen/Synodis, und was solchem allem mehr anhanget/gehalten werden sol* (Leipzig, 1580).

[41] Jacob Andreae, who supported this point in the order, was himself chancellor of the University of Tübingen.

against the vociferous opposition of the faculties themselves. Unlike the biennially elected rector, the chancellor was appointed for life. His duties included monitoring "pure doctrine" at the university (the position was to be filled by a member of the theology faculty), enforcing discipline, and arbitrating disputes.[42] He reported directly to the elector or, in less serious cases, to the second office instated by the new orders, the perpetual commissars (*commissarii perpetui*), a group of generally four outside court-appointed administrators. Unlike the chancellor, these men were not theologians but high-ranking political officials. They were to be given annual reports by the rector, chancellor, and governing council of the university, and thereby monitor the institution's adherence to its ordinances and statutes. Perhaps the most notable change affecting the faculty members personally was a new requirement that they swear an oath of allegiance to the Formula of Concord.[43] This applied to members of all faculties, not just the theologians. In addition to these novelties, the well-established practice of visitation was, of course, continued, ensuring regular contact with the monitoring powers of the court.

August also sought to regulate the internal aspects of academic life. Apparently persuaded by Andreae's arguments in favor of disputations, he ordered them to be held monthly. His interest showed nothing of Andreae's epistemological nuance, though; August viewed disputation simply as something to ward off heresy.[44] As a consequence, he expended considerable energy in trying to regulate their content. Disputations were required to defend positions that were, above all, true. To give himself peace of mind in this respect, August demanded that only regular professors of theology be allowed to preside at public disputations; they were required, in turn, to publish their theses five days prior to the disputation itself, but only after having submitted them to the scrutiny of their colleagues two weeks previously. Leaving no detail unattended, August even prescribed the type of argument to be used (syllogisms) and the length of the opponents' responses (three to

[42] *Ordnung* 1580, p. 371; cf. Appold, *Orthodoxie*, p. 26.

[43] The rule took effect in Wittenberg in January 1581. Cf. *Liber decanorum facultatis theologicae Academiae Vitebergensis*, ed. Karl Eduard Förstemann (Leipzig, 1838), pp. 59–60; also Appold, *Orthodoxie*, p. 32.

[44] Ibid., pp. 30–35.

four arguments at most). Prooftexts were to be taken exclusively from Holy Scripture.[45]

Universities and Censorship

All in all, August's measures were remarkable mostly for their emphasis on disputation; this was unusual at the time. The other disciplinary instruments were common, something to which most universities of the day were subjected.[46] The desire of early-modern rulers to regulate academic discourse was particularly pronounced, resulting in elaborate schemes of censorship. Censorship of books received a major impetus through the Edict of Worms in 1521 and was initially directed against Luther's writings. That fact did not prevent Protestant princes from warming to the possibilities of censorship, however, and later adapting it to their own more local needs. Lists of forbidden books were released, affected writings confiscated; printers who sought approval were made to swear oaths of orthodoxy and loyalty, and their premises were inspected. Initially, the universities were enlisted in this process: no book could be published without their written permission.[47] As the universities themselves fell into disrepute at the court, however, they too were censored, both internally by a form of prescribed collegial self-censorship (as in the case of the disputations), and externally by the courts' consistories. Professors were frequently required to submit their texts to the court, where they were examined for heresy. That burden was by no means restricted to their published work: in 17th-century Wittenberg, for example, they had to present entire transcripts of their university lectures.[48] Most scholars resisted censorship at least in part.

---

[45] In fact, prooftexts from the Church Fathers or Councils were admitted, too, as long as they remained subordinate to Scripture. Cf. ibid., pp. 29–31.

[46] In Wittenberg itself many measures introduced by the 1580 order were rescinded by August's son, Christian I, who took office upon his father's death in 1586. Cf. Appold, *Orthodoxie*, pp. 35–40.

[47] On the development of early-modern censorship in general, and the case of censorship of books during Electoral Saxony's Cryptocalvinist controversies, cf. Hans-Peter Hasse, *Zensur theologischer Bücher in Kursachsen im konfessionellen Zeitalter. Studien zur kursächsischen Literatur- und Religionspolitik in den Jahren 1569 bis 1575* (Leipzig, 2000).

[48] Elector Christian II. introduced a so-called *examen neglectuum* in Electoral Saxony in 1606, by which he sought above all to make sure his professors actually held lectures (some, particularly in law, appeared negligent in this respect). The order required evey faculty member to submit a transcript, written by a student in the course, to the consistory in Dresden. Needless to say, professors were not enthusiastic and rarely complied, despite repeated threats and exacted fines. Cf. Appold, *Orthodoxie*, pp. 45–48.

They routinely ignored the demand for lecture transcripts, for example, and occasionally protested other measures—or tried to circumvent them by finding foreign publishers.[49] Still, censorship was a constant fact of academic life and a significant hindrance to free discourse; even when it was not exercised in fact, its ominous possibility remained in mind.

Universities as Instruments of Confessional Identity

Given the high degree of supervision exercised by early-modern *Landesherren*, it should come as no surprise that university life inevitably bore their strong personal imprint. Even when supervisory functions were carried out by delegates such as consistories, commissars, and visitors, they reflected the will and, more significantly, the confessional persuasion of the ruler himself. The delegates were appointed directly by him and reported back to him; room for personal initiative on their part was scant. In Electoral Saxony the universities swung pendulum-like from Philippist/Reformed to Orthodox Lutheran positions and reverse within a matter of just a few years. August first purged the Philippists in 1574, redoubled his efforts in 1577, and established a Lutheran Orthodoxy, but died in 1586, leaving his pro-Calvinist son, Christian I, to wipe the slate clean again. Christian, fond of the bottle, succumbed to it in 1591, and once again professors were ousted; a new group was brought in by his successor, who was loyal to the Formula of Concord. That situation then remained stable into the 18th century.

Other universities experienced fates no less turbulent. At Marburg, for example, which was co-administered by the Reformed house of Hesse-Cassel and Lutheran Hesse-Darmstadt,[50] the school's confessional identity depended upon which of the two was dominant at a given time. In 1605 Landgrave Moritz of Hesse-Cassel managed to impose a series of "points of improvement" (*Verbesserungspunkte*) on his lands, including the Marburg university.[51] These points effectively implemented Reformed confessionalization and involved a stipulation on breaking

[49] For example, cf. Robert Kolb, "Mathaeus Judex's Condemnation of Princely Censorship of Theologians' Publications," in *CH* 50 (1981), 401–414 [reprinted in idem, *Luther's Heirs Define His Legacy* (Aldershot, 1996), no. XIV].

[50] After Landgrave Philip of Hesse died in 1567, his territory was divided up between four sons, a situation which eventually yielded the two dynasties of Hesse-Cassel and Hesse-Darmstadt. Marburg, whose ruling line had died out, fell between the two.

[51] Cf. Gerhard Menk, "Die 'zweite Reformation' in Hessen-Kassel. Landgraf Moritz und die Einführung der Verbesserungspunkte", in *Die reformierte Konfessionalisierung*, pp. 154–83.

bread at Communion, removing "idols" from churches and—importantly for academic life—a ban on disputations that proposed Christ's ubiquity.[52] Appalled, the Marburg theologians resisted, were fired, and fled to nearby Gießen, where a Lutheran university was opened in 1607 by Landgrave Ludwig V of Hesse-Darmstadt. During the Thirty Years War the Darmstadt dynasty resumed control of Marburg, allowing the Lutherans to return. The Reformed theologians, meanwhile, took up residence in a short-lived university of Cassel. As the war ended, the universities' fortunes changed once more: the Marburg Lutherans went back to Gießen, Cassel closed, and the Reformed returned to Marburg.

As such cases illustrate, it was practically impossible to teach at a university whose *Landesherr* did not approve of one's confession. That was true even where a limited degree of confessional freedom was possible—possible because it was part of the political program. The Viadrina University of Frankfurt/Oder is a good case in point. Brandenburg's elector Joachim II implemented the Reformation in 1539/1540 after extensive personal communication with Melanchthon. The reformer's influence and connections initially gave the university a strong melanchthonian character.[53] Later, as recently-arrived anti-philippist theologians began to circulate polemical writings, Joachim II countered by issuing an "Edict of Tolerance" in 1562. Though this failed to bring immediate relief, it did point the way toward a long-term trend that proved particularly hospitable to philippist Lutherans and Calvinists. After the purges in Electoral Saxony large numbers of students and faculty members "fled" to Frankfurt, which soon rivaled the Saxon universities in size and academic reputation and became something of an "Ersatz-Wittenberg" for Philippists.[54] At the same time conservative Lutheran elements remained, and the Formula of Concord stood as the governing confession. Even tolerance took its cue from the court. It took a strange twist after 1610, however, as the Brandenburg court veered toward the Reformed confession. Elector John Sigismund began by rescinding the university's commitment to the

[52] All of these were classic points of contention that marked confessional differences between Lutherans and Reformed; cf. Dingel's essay above.

[53] On the early history of the Viadrina, cf. Höhle, *Universität und Reformation*, and Günter Mühlpfordt, "Die Oder-Universität 1506–1811," in *Die Oder-Universität Frankfurt. Beiträge zu ihrer Geschichte* (Weimar, 1983), pp. 19–72.

[54] Ibid., p. 46.

Formula of Concord in 1610 and then became Reformed personally in 1613. Neither the people of Brandenburg nor Frankfurt university were prepared to follow course, however, and they resisted conversion. Bit by bit, the elector prevailed upon the university to accept Calvinist theology professors.[55] Interestingly—and unlike his counterparts in other territories—he did not force exponents of the other confession out, and many Lutheran professors stayed. As a result, the Viadrina was one of the few genuinely "polyconfessional" universities in 17th-century Germany, appointing both Lutheran and Reformed theologians according to a strict principle of parity,[56] accompanied by repeated admonitions to "tolerance".[57] Members of both confessions developed a distinctively irenical style, which, ironically, earned them sustained polemic from their colleagues at monoconfessional institutions elsewhere. The situation reflects the complicated political circumstances surrounding a line of ambitious Brandenburg rulers who, while personally Reformed, sought to turn a predominantly Lutheran land into a modern state. It should not come as a complete surprise that, a century and a half later, descendants of those same rulers gave Germany the "Prussian Union". Those "unionistic" tendencies were already pronounced during the 17th century.

Interwoven with the Hohenzollern dynasty's church-political plans was the ecumenical work of Georg Calixt, theology professor at the University of Helmstedt. Calixt's ecumenism is an example of an initiative that did not originate with a political ruler, but was born independently out of a university context.[58] That it gestated in Helmstedt was no accident. Duke Julius of Braunschweig-Wolfenbuettel had opened the university in 1576; amidst conflicting parties at the university was one that set a course sympathetic to a Melanchthon-style humanism.[59] Braunschweig-Wolfenbuettel did not ratify the Formula of Concord, and professors were asked to sign on to a regionally specific *Corpus doctrinae*

---

[55] Ibid., pp. 47–50.

[56] Cf. Gerd Heinrich, "Frankfurt an der Oder, Universität," TRE 11:335–342; 338–39.

[57] To be fair, Brandenburg's electors were generally more sensitive toward anti-Reformed polemic; opening the door to greater acceptance of the Reformed cause may have been at least as important as more abstract notions of religious tolerance.

[58] Cf. Johannes Wallmann, "Zwischen Reformation und Humanismus. Eigenart und Wirkungen Helmstedter Theologie unter besonderer Berücksichtigung Georg Calixts," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 74 (1977), 344–370.

[59] Cf. Hans Haase, *Die Universität Helmstedt 1576–1810.* (Wolfenbüttel, 1976); Inge Mager, "Helmstedt, Universität," TRE 15:35–39.

instead, a product of the work of Martin Chemnitz. Helmstedt emerged as a center of late-humanist thought, led by philosophers such as John Caselius and Cornelius Martini. Martini ushered in an aristotelian renaissance and is generally credited with re-introducing Aristotle's metaphysics into Lutheran thought.[60] As his colleagues in the faculty of theology objected, Duke Julius intervened and sided with Martini. Georg Calixt was Martini's student and brought a similarly innovative spirit to the field of theology. After outlasting the opposition of his more conservative colleagues, he remolded the faculty in a sympathetic vein, making Helmstedt a center of ecumenical thinking. Calixt's initiatives, which focused on ecclesial union between Lutherans, Reformed, and Roman Catholics based on their common acceptance of Scripture and patristic tradition, dovetailed nicely with the political aims of both his own territorial rulers and those in Brandenburg. Orthodox Lutherans in other parts of Germany opposed this conglomeration vehemently, accusing Calixt of "syncretism" and engaging in a drawn-out controversy that pitted the theology faculties of Wittenberg and Helmstedt as main protagonists. The conflict was as much about the Hohenzollerns' unionist politics as it was about theology.[61] As one of its consequences, Brandenburg's "Great Elector," the Reformed Frederick William, issued an edict in 1662 prohibiting his subjects from attending the Lutheran universities of Wittenberg and Leipzig.

Scholarship Aid in the Age of Confessionalization

As all of these examples illustrate, the main contours of academic life at early-modern universities were largely dictated by political rulers. From the standpoint of today's notions of academic freedom, that was rarely a felicitous set of circumstances. But *Landesherren* did not only act repressively toward their institutions of higher learning. Even someone as heavy-handed as August I of Saxony made significant positive contributions to academic life as well. One of the most important

[60] Cf. Walter Sparn, *Wiederkehr der Metaphysik. Die ontologische Frage in der lutherischen Theologie des frühen 17. Jahrhunderts* (Stuttgart, 1976).

[61] One of Calixt's leading opponents was Abraham Calov (1612–1686), who first encountered him at the Colloquy of Thorn in Prussia in 1645. A literary battle, known as the "Syncretist Controversy" ensued, heating up after Calov was called to Wittenberg in 1650. Cf. Johannes Wallmann, "Abraham Calov—theologischer Widerpart der Religionspolitik des Großen Kurfürsten," in *700 Jahre Wittenberg: Stadt, Universität, Reformation*, ed. Stefan Oehmig (Weimar, 1995), pp. 303–11.

took the form of a state scholarship program for needy students. To be fair, programs of this kind had existed previously and were also found at other universities.[62] Yet August, prompted by Jacob Andreae, put considerable effort into expanding the state-sponsored program in Electoral Saxony. His 1580 ordinances outlined a system that projected 150 four-year scholarships for each of the two universities in Leipzig and Wittenberg. In Wittenberg he bought the "Luther House"[63] and added a substantial new construction on the site. The "Collegium Augusti," as it was now called, served as cheap housing for scholarship students; a cafeteria ("Gemeiner Tisch") provided them with free meals. Even though numbers of actually awarded stipends fell short of the projected 150,[64] the program went a long way toward giving many students access to an education they could otherwise never have enjoyed. Like most rulers of his day August was not motivated by sheer magnanimity, however. In fact, his scholarship provisions reveal a remarkably keen sense for the practical benefits of education suggested by Frederick the Wise at Wittenberg's founding. August wanted a reliable pool of well-trained public servants. To this end he demanded that every recipient of scholarship aid first swear an oath of allegiance to the *Landesherr* and commit himself to serving the state upon graduation—or earlier, at the elector's discretion. Scholarships were furthermore restricted to residents of Electoral Saxony, who had to promise to remain in the land after graduating. Their lives were carefully and comprehensively regulated: personal monitoring by designated inspectors and regular exams made sure the students' performance remained on course; strict behavioral codes were enforced as well.[65] Symptomatic for this age of confessionalization were the religious requirements added to the scholarship provisions: confessional loyalty, mandatory attendance at worship services, compulsory course-work in theology, and the prioritization

[62] Pre-1548 Wittenberg, then in Ernestine hands, had an expansive scholarship program which in 1545 made provisions for 150 state scholarships. The Albertine rulers initially proved less magnanimous; Wittenberg had to wait until 1564 before August established a first systematic program, for a total of 27 scholarships. In other territories Tübingen and Marburg stand out with their well-established scholarship systems. On Wittenberg's scholarship program, cf. Gößner, *Studenten*, pp. 102–44.

[63] August bought Luther's former home, originally an Augustinian monastery, from the late reformer's heirs in 1564. Cf. Gößner, *Studenten*, p. 120 (lit.).

[64] By 1584, financial realities forced a reduction to 120 stipends; in later years, the numbers fell to about 75. Ibid., pp. 116–17.

[65] Ibid., pp. 114–117.

of vocations in schools and churches after graduation.[66] In that regard August and his early-modern contemporaries were considerably less interested in using scholarship programs to effect social change than in drawing on them to maximize human resources for their burgeoning state administrations.

The fact that university enrollment figures rose consistently throughout the 16th and early 17th centuries—with commensurate gaps in times of war or disease—shows that there was a yearning for higher education whose roots extended well beyond such political utilitarianism. State scholarships, while significant, represented a small minority of the total student body.[67] Private scholarships made up an additional group and grew alongside their public counterparts.[68] Since they were established by private donors and their terms recorded, they offer interesting insight into the educational values of "common people;" needless to say, these tended to differ substantially from those of the ruling class. Most viewed higher education as an opportunity for social advancement or security to be passed on to the next generation. Hence, many private scholarship endowments gave priority to the donor's relatives.[69] Others, however, show a social sensibility imbued with an explicit desire to overcome class-related barriers. One of the better-endowed private scholarships in 17th-century Wittenberg was the so-called "Hoboldt Fund," established in 1635. The scholarship terms made express provisions for children

[66] Gößner quite accurately describes the process as a "Theologisierung des Stipendiatenwesens" (*Studenten*, p. 116).

[67] Figures for the University of Wittenberg provide a statistical approximation: at any given time during a four-year period between 1550 and 1630, there were between 75 and 140 state scholarship recipients, but a total of 1500–3000 students, ibid., p. 68; Helmar Junghans, *Martin Luther und Wittenberg* (Munich/Berlin, 1996), pp. 212–13. Precise enrollment figures are difficult to ascertain because documentation on students' duration of study tends to be vague.

[68] Numbers are harder to ascertain, since private scholarships were administered from a variety of sources. Gößner (*Studenten*, p. 101) counts 15 in Wittenberg's university archives established during the second half of the 16th century. That number grew substantially during the 17th century, however, and many of these foundations were channelled through Wittenberg's common chest, which was administered by the city church. Cf. Archiv der Stadtkirche Wittenberg (= WB StKA), AI 63; also Kenneth G. Appold, "'Extra Academiam vivere, non est vivere'. Der Theologe Paul Röber (1587–1651) und die Frage nach dem Lebensbezug der Universität," in *500 Jahre Theologie in Wittenberg und Halle*… (Leipzig, 2003), pp. 51–77; 67–70.

[69] Cf. Gößner, *Studenten*, pp. 90–101.

of handcraftsmen—i.e. members of the "working class"—who desired to study Lutheran theology.[70]

Lutheran Theologians as Agents of Confessionalization?

Looking back at this extensive degree of state control over early-modern university life, one finds oneself asking what role theologians played in the process. Were they "agents of Confessionalization," as some historians contend?[71] Or, as many of the events described above suggest instead, were they victims of political oppression?

Recent scholarship has painted a more nuanced picture of the period than such black-and-white alternatives allow. On the one hand, early-modern academic theologians were servants of the state and played an active and visible role in implementing their rulers' policies. In all matters relating to religion, they were the experts. Together with lawyers, they staffed the consistories, the court's most important supervisory instrument relating to religion and education. They carried out visitations, represented their rulers at religious colloquies, provided counsel, and drafted responses (*Gutachten*) related to the public administration of religious affairs.[72] University theologians were, as mentioned above, heavily involved in the censorship process. From their ranks, too, came the authors of the period's church orders and confessional documents, including the Formula of Concord, the (Reformed) Bremen Consensus, or the failed *Consensus repetitus fidei vere lutheranae* of the mid-17th-century. On the other hand, the ways in which they carried out those functions were not always consistent with—or even appealing to—the rulers who appointed them, even in those cases where the two groups had the same basic confessional commitments. As court chaplains (*Hofprediger*), they frequently used their position to scold the *Landesherr* or to call for social reform, for example.[73] In other instances they pursued church-political

[70] The scholarship was set up for "Studiosis armen Bürgers unnd handtwergskindern, so theologiam studiren, unnd der rechten unveränderten Augspurgischen Confession zugethan," WB StKA, AI 71. Cf. Appold, "Extra Academiam," pp. 68–69.

[71] Lewis Spitz uses the related term "agents of confessionalism" in "Importance of the Reformation," p. 56. Among others, Thomas Kaufmann has painted a similar picture, arguing that "without theology professors there would have been no confessionalization". Kaufmann, *Universität*, p. 605.

[72] For an example of how such processes worked, cf. Kenneth G. Appold, "Early Lutheran Attitudes toward Jews", *LQ* 20 (2006), 170–89.

[73] Cf. Wolfgang Sommer, *Gottesfurcht und Fürstenherrschaft. Studien zum Obrigkeitsverständnis Johann Arndts und lutherischer Hofprediger zur Zeit der altprotestantischer Orthodoxie* (Göttingen,

lines against the will of their rulers, as, for example, when Abraham Calov clandestinely published polemical writings in the 1680s despite having been forbidden to do so by the Saxon elector. At the level of university teaching, conflicts between the consistory's censorship activities and professors also testify to a complex, frequently contentious, relationship between court and gown. In addition, it should be remembered that scholars were, after all, interested in scholarship—and a good amount of their work was inherently resistant to princely efforts to pragmatize learning. A well-developed network of communication between scholars, itself a product of pre-Reformation humanism, now continued, frequently without regard to confessional "boundaries". This was a kind of "parallel world" of the mind that had little to do with confessionalization.[74] Finally, there were many situations, as in the above-mentioned Frankfurt/Oder, Marburg, and late-16th-century Wittenberg and Leipzig, where academic theologians were fundamentally at odds with the confessional politics of their rulers. All in all, few, if any, early-modern theologians were in a position to initiate or to define public policy toward religion or the academy. They were secondary players in a world shaped by their hereditary rulers.

Much of the evidence suggests that the two groups were pursuing fundamentally different, if often overlapping, agendas with respect to public life. Whereas princes aimed at rationalizing as much of their subjects' lives as possible in order to establish absolutist state machineries, theologians appear interested in continuing a process of religious education and edification which may tentatively be described as "Christianization;"[75] they wanted a more Christian society. How they

1988). For an account of Paul Röber's strongly voiced social criticism while court chaplain in Halle, cf. Appold, "Extra Academiam," pp. 64–67. Röber (1587–1651) later joined the theology faculty in Wittenberg, where he also exercised the episcopal function of church superintendent. A collection of essays focused on political resistance in early-modern Europe is published in *Zeitschrift für Historische Forschung* Beiheift 26 (2001).

[74] On the implications of such a "republic of letters" (*Gelehrtenrepublik*) for confessionalization, cf. Anselm Schubert, "Kommunikation und Konkurrenz. Gelehrtenrepublik und Konfession im 17. Jahrhundert", in *Interkonfessionalität*, pp. 105–31; also the papers in *Res publica litteraria. Die Institutionen der Gelehrsamkeit in der frühen Neuzeit*, ed. Sebastian Neumeister and Conrad Wiedemann (Wiesbaden, 1987).

[75] This process began much earlier and reached a highpoint during the Reformation. For more on this, and on the term itself, cf. Scott Hendrix, *Recultivating the Vineyard: The Reformation Agendas of Christianization* (Louisville, 2004).

understood that, and how it both concurred with and differed from princely agendas of confessionalization, will be assessed below.

Academic Teaching at Early-Modern Faculties of Theology

Theology as a "Practical Science"

As early-modern German societies developed into absolutist states, the politics of confessionalization provided an encompassing cultural context for much of private and public life. Academic thought, too, unfolded within the hermeneutics provided by this domineering paradigm. The very definition of theology, as it became current in 17th-century Lutheranism, may be viewed as a product of that culture.

The statement "*Vera theologia est practica*" would have been music to most early-modern rulers' ears. In fact, as Luther uttered these words,[76] he was signalling a break with "speculative" scholastic theology ("die gehort in die hell zum Teuffel") in favor of a theology oriented towards what God *does* in the world—a science focused on God's communication of the gospel message *pro nobis*. Inasmuch as politicians in general have trouble recognizing the value of a science that has no immediate "real-world" application, few Protestant princes would have mourned the disappearance of medieval scholasticism; on the other hand, they readily supported the brand of theology that replaced it. While Luther himself appears to have given relatively little thought to the methodological implications of his words,[77] his academic successors took up the notion of theology as a "practical science" and made it the cornerstone of an entirely new approach to theological method. They fashioned what came to be known as theological "systems"—whence the modern term "systematic theology". In addition to dealing with theology as a practical science, the systems themselves had a highly pragmatic focus: they were designed to teach theologians how to lead persons toward salvation. These systems were tools of Christianization. To that extent, they nicely met princely expectations of a science with tangible benefit to society, in this case producing more effective pastors. In the academic

[76] WATR 1:72–73 (# 153); LW 54:22.

[77] On Luther's and the other reformers' thoughts on theological ecucation, cf. Marcel Nieden, *Die Erfindung des Theologen. Wittenberger Anweisungen zum Theologiestudium im Zeitalter von Reformation und Konfessionalisierung* (Tübingen, 2006), pp. 69–97.

culture whose main themes were sounded by nearly every ruler since Frederick the Wise founded the University of Wittenberg in 1502, being "practical" was also being "politically correct".

Central to the construction of 17th-century Lutheran systems of theology were Philip Melanchthon's *Loci*. Melanchthon had revolutionized the study of theology with the first edition of the *Loci communes* in 1521. Breaking with scholastic ideals of comprehensiveness exemplified by medieval *summae*, Melanchthon re-organized the presentation of doctrine according to its soteriological significance: the *Loci communes* were pared down to only those doctrines that are necessary for explaining how justification works (the so-called *loci salutares*).[78] Though Melanchthon expanded the scope of his *Loci* in later editions, both his soteriological concentration and the text itself exerted a formative influence on Lutheran Orthodoxy's approach to theology. Melanchthon's *Loci* continued to be read at Lutheran universities well into the 17th century, and his successors at those universities often based their own systems upon them. That is particularly remarkable when one considers the generally cool, if not outright hostile attitude of a predominantly (but in fact quite nuanced) anti-philippist climate. His works remained influential, a testimony to their enduring persuasiveness.[79]

A rediscovery of aristotelian logic accompanied the evolution of those theological systems. The main impetus for that rediscovery came from the Italian philosopher Giacomo Zabarella, whose *Opera Logica* revolutionized German Protestant approaches to method. Following Zabarella, Lutherans such as Georg Calixt in Helmstedt. Balthasar Mentzer in Gießen/Marburg, and Balthasar Meisner in Wittenberg refined their understanding of theology's practical nature.[80] Theology was practical

[78] I have given a broader account of this process and its significance for Lutheran method in *Abraham Calov's Doctrine of Vocatio in Its Systematic Context* (Tübingen, 1998) pp. 16–29.

[79] On Melanchthon's continuing influence over 17th-century Lutheranism, cf. *Melanchthonbild und Melanchthonrezeption in der Lutherischen Orthodoxie und im Pietismus*, ed. Udo Sträter (Wittenberg, 1999).

[80] Keckermann is generally held to be the main conduit by which Zabarella's thought came to the Lutherans. Recent scholarship suggests a parallel line of reception within Lutheranism, though. The Wittenberg philosopher Daniel Cramer, who helped introduce an aristotelian renaissance to the Leucorea and was familiar with Zabarella's work as well, spoke about the need to create scientific "systems" as early as 1593. His friend and colleague Matthias Flacius, jun., who taught in Rostock, advocated Zabarella's method in his *Opus logicum in Organon Aristotelis* (Frankfurt/Main, 1593). Though there is no evidence that either of the two applied the new method to

because it had a practical end; it was an applied science that teaches men how to lead others toward salvation—much like medicine is a science that teaches physicians how to lead their patients to physical health.[81] In this regard Orthodoxy changed the notion of theology's practical nature in an important way: following Luther, previous generations had deemed it practical because it leads the person who practices it to faith; now, it was practical because it helped lead *others* to faith. It had become a teaching science.[82] Zabarella had supplied an appropriate method, the *ordo analyticus*, or analytic method, which facilitated that newly-defined application. Following the analytic method, theologians structured their "systems" of *loci* by first specifying theology's goal (salvation), then identifying the subject in whom the goal is to be realized (the human sinner), and closing with a delineation of the means by which that is to happen (means and principles of salvation). After the Reformed theologian Bartholomäus Keckermann applied Zabarella's methodology to his *Systema theologiae* in 1602,[83] Lutherans began to follow suit: Johannes Förster in 1608,[84] Balthasar Mentzer in 1610,[85] Georg Calixt in 1611/1616,[86] and Balthasar Meisner in 1625.[87] Theologi-

---

theology, their remarks point to an earlier Zabarella-reception in Lutheranism than hitherto assumed (cf. Appold, *Orthodoxie*, pp. 70–71).

[81] Balthasar Meisner's definition of theology is characteristic of the new approach: "Theologia est Habitus θεοσδοτος Practicus Dei auxilio ex verbo Dei comparatus, in mente Theologi existens; eumque dirigens, ut homines lapsos, per veram religionem perduceat ad aeternam beatitudinem," Meisner, "Praecognitorum theologicorum disputatio VIII"/Resp. Jacobus Stolterfoht (Wittenberg, 1625).

[82] To describe this transition Nieden has introduced a useful distinction between theology as "autopraxis" and "allopraxis;" cf. Nieden, *Erfindung*, p. 192.

[83] Bartholomäus Keckermann, *Systema S.S. theologiae, tribus libris adornatum* (Hanau, 1602).

[84] Johannes Förster, *Systema problematum theologicorum*… (Wittenberg, 1610). The disputations that comprise Förster's system were published individually in 1608–1609 while Förster was theology professor in Wittenberg. The first of these describes his use of Zabarella: J. Förster, "Exercitationum theologicarum disputatio I: de theologia in genere"/Resp. Elia Ursinus (Wittenberg, 1608).

[85] Balthasar Mentzer, "Synopsis theologiae analytico ordine comprehensa"/Resp. Johannes Scholvinus (Giessen, 1610); like Förster's, this work was presented as a disputation.

[86] Calixt's major dogmatic work, the *Epitome theologiae* (Goslar, 1619), is based on transcripts of lectures he held in Helmstedt in 1616. A shorter piece, "De constitutione S. Theologiae tractatus," also applies the analytic method and was written in 1611/1612; it remained unpublished until the 20th century; cf. Georg Calixt, *Dogmatische Schriften* [vol. 2 of *Werke in Auswahl*], ed. Inge Mager (Göttingen, 1982), pp. 9–29.

[87] Of all these, Meisner provided the deepest reflection on the practical nature of theology and its methodological implications in volume 3 of his *Philosophia sobria* (Wittenberg, 1623) and in a series of theological disputations that were intended to apply

cal systems reached their apogee during the second half of the 17th century in the monumental work of Abraham Calov,[88] and the more manageable, therefore more widely read, textbooks of Johann Friedrich König[89] and Johann Andreas Quenstedt.[90] Even 18th-century Lutherans, most notably David Hollaz,[91] a student of Calov and Quenstedt, continued in that vein.

Not all 17th-century Lutherans adopted the analytic method. The most significant of those who refused were Johann Gerhard and Jacob Martini. Gerhard, who taught in Jena, published his *Loci theologici* in 1610, adding a chapter on the nature of theology in 1625 ("Prooemium de natura theologiae"). Gerhard's work reflects the transitional state of theological method during this period. On the one hand, it continues an approach that ran from Melanchthon through the late-16th-century *loci* textbooks of Martin Chemnitz, Jacob Heerbrand, and others. On the other hand, Gerhard is aware of the new wave in methodological reflection and incorporates some of it in the 1625 "Prooemium," albeit without changing the overall structure of the work. While magisterial in their scope and depth of insight, his *Loci* remain transitional and tentative in their use of method.[92]

Unlike Gerhard, Jacob Martini was an accomplished philosopher. His influential *Vernunfftspiegel*[93] praised the dignity and scope of natural reason and helped establish philosophy as an integral part of theological studies. Martini spent two decades as a professor of logic and metaphysics in Wittenberg before moving to the faculty of theology there and working alongside Balthasar Meisner.[94] Although his dogmatics

---

the new method, but were cut short by Meisner's death The first installment is a series of ten disputations on method and theory: B. Meisner, "Praecognitorum theologicorum disputationes" (Wittenberg, 1625). Cf. Appold, *Orthodoxie*, pp. 64–67.

[88] Abraham Calov, *Systema locorum theologicorum*, 12 vols. (Wittenberg, 1655–1677).

[89] Johann Friedrich König, *Theologia positiva acroamatica, synoptice tractata* (Rostock, 1664). For a translation into German and analysis, cf. Andreas Stegmann, *Johann Friedrich König: Seine Theologia positiva acroamatica (1664) im Rahmen des frühneuzeitlichen Theologiestudiums* (Tübingen, 2006).

[90] Johann Andreas Quenstedt, *Theologia didactico-polemica* (Wittenberg, 1685).

[91] David Hollaz, *Examen theologicum acroamaticum universam theologiam thetico-polemicam complectens* (Stargard, 1707). Hollaz' work was republished repeatedly throughout the 18th century.

[92] For a comparison of Gerhard's methods with those of Calixt, cf. Johannes Wallmann, *Der Theologiebegriff bei Johann Gerhard und Georg Calixt* (Tübingen, 1961).

[93] Jacob Martini, *Vernunfftspiegel. Das ist/Gründlicher unnd unwidertreiblicher Bericht/was die Vernunfft/sampt derselbigen perfection, Philosophia genandt/sey…* (Wittenberg, 1618).

[94] Martini joined the philosophy faculty in 1602, theology in 1623.

textbook was published three times during this period and he otherwise wrote copiously in the field,[95] Martini consistently refused to adopt the new approach championed by Meisner. His precise reasons remained unspecified, though they cannot have been the result of ignorance. Martini deliberately retains a version of the traditional noetic definition of theology—namely as knowledge of God and of divine things.[96] Rather than focusing on theology as a practical science analogous to medicine, a conception geared toward field ministry, Martini stresses a need to educate a theological elite whose home was the university rather than the parish. If one seeks to create a "*theologus perfectus*" (an ideal-case theologian with optimal schooling) as opposed to a "*minister vulgarus*" (a common parish pastor), one requires a program of education honed to the acquisition of theoretical knowledge and sound judgement. Martini was no less "practically-minded" than his colleague Meisner, but he recognized the need for an additional kind of theologian, one who has the advanced skills to teach academically, explain Scripture and argue with confessional adversaries.[97] In his dedication to that vision, Martini was a purist. He resisted the politically-motivated utilitarianism of the day and emphasized a pure approach to learning that drew heavily on philosophy. That approach also included room for academic freedom, which Martini defended against what he felt were inappropriate princely incursions.[98] Tellingly, Wittenberg in his day was able to harbor two fundamentally different definitions of theology in relative harmony—something he himself noted on occasion.[99] Scholars like Jacob Martini point to a significant trend in early-modern theology.

---

[95] Jacob Martini, *Partitiones theologicae* (Wittenberg, [1]1612/[2]1626/[3]1646).

[96] "Theologia est agnitio veritatis coelestis, quae pietatem respicit, in scriptis Prophetarum et Apostolorum fundata, ad spem vitae aeternae a Deo promissae" (ibid., Disp. 1, thesis 1). Martini thereby refocused attention on the theologian as primary beneficiary of theology.

[97] Jacob Martini, *Vernunfftspiegel*, p. 991. The fact that Martini felt an advanced education is required to explain Scripture is worth noting. Exegesis involved considerable language skills, philosophical training and, increasingly, knowledge of ancient cultural history (see below).

[98] In at least one recorded case, Martini crossed swords with John George I over the elector's attempt to censor a disputation held under Martini's auspices; Martini scoffed at the charges, remarking that one needs to allow students a certain degree of freedom in formulating their opinions. Cf. Appold, *Orthodoxie*, p. 42 (n. 121).

[99] Martini eulogized Meisner at the latter's funeral, pointing out, among other things, that their shared commitment to truth forged a bond of friendship that individual disagreements could not disrupt. Cf. J. Martini, *Christlicher Leichsermon… bey volckreicher Leichbegängniß des… Herrn Balthasaris Meisneri* (Wittenberg, 1627), p. 41; also Appold, *Orthodoxie*, p. 66.

They established a current that ran counter to the politically-motivated interest in practical application and intellectual uniformity and embodied an educational ethos dedicated to the pure pursuit of truth.

Studying Theology: the University Curriculum

The period's penchant for the practical imbued the curriculum as well. The purpose of that curriculum lay in educating prospective pastors. While the reformers had viewed academic study as a means for shaping the student's personal piety, their successors tended to focus on its value for educating clergy who could advance their parishioners' piety, thus mirroring the shift in how theology's "practical" nature was understood. Those changes in the underlying rationale for studying theology had a comparatively minor impact on the fundamental shape of the curriculum, however. Its main contours were laid during the mid-sixteenth-century reforms initiated by Melanchthon and Luther.

Central to the reformers' vision of academic theology was a focus on the Word of God, i.e. on biblical exegesis. The curriculum, which in Wittenberg and many other Lutheran universities was taught by four full professors (*ordinarii*) on average,[100] reflected that priority. One professor covered the Pentateuch and early Prophets, another the late Prophets, a third the New Testament Epistles, and a fourth the dogmatic *loci* as outlined by Melanchthon. That program presupposed a full course of preparatory study in the faculty of arts. When Jacob Andreae and Elector August renewed the curriculum in Saxony in 1577–1580, they affirmed this basic structure. It remained in place for most of the ensuing age of Orthodoxy.[101] The later trend toward an allopractic understanding of theology did not change the overall pattern since the new approach drew its subject-matter from the same sources—Scripture, church fathers, theological *loci*—as the older. Indirectly, use of the analytic method yielded a number of new doctrinal topics; concentration on the means of salvation led to increased reflection on the work of the Holy Spirit, for example, producing the so-called *ordo salutis* and *loci*

[100] There was always a degree of local variation to this pattern. Institutionally, it was also affected by an increase in "extraordinary" faculty, i.e. instructors without a permanent position, many of whom offered "private" courses that augmented the regular curriculum.

[101] On these developments at Rostock, cf. Kaufmann, *Universität*, pp. 391–433; for Wittenberg, cf. Nieden, *Erfindung*, passim.

on topics like mystical union. Aside from that development, the most significant long-term changes to the theological curriculum took the form of an increased attention to the Augsburg Confession, which soon became a standard part of virtually every Lutheran faculty's teaching program, and an enduring focus on controversial theology, sometimes known as polemic. The purpose of the latter was twofold. On the one hand, reading the works of Roman Catholic and Reformed (and later Socinian) theologians prepared students to defend Lutheran doctrine against its most significant critics. On the other hand, Lutherans were remarkably open-minded about the possibility of finding truth, or at least valuable insights, in the works of other confessions, as illustrated by their uninhibited use of quotations from those works whenever it suited their purposes.[102] More far-reaching changes to the curriculum came at the preparatory level, namely in the faculty of arts. The late-16th-century revival of aristotelian philosophy led to an expansion of corresponding studies, most notably by the inclusion of metaphysics and logic.[103] In addition, the study of biblical languages expanded enormously during the 17th century, propelled by the establishment of chairs for oriental studies (i.e. Near Eastern languages and culture), and came to include Aramaic, Syriac, and in some cases Arabic, while simultaneously intensifying Hebrew studies. Astronomy, too, attracted growing attention in the *artes* faculty. Its fruits frequently appear in theology of the period. Such expansion poses the question of the length of time typical students studied at the university. Comments by Andreae and others, as well as scholarship provisions, suggest a program of four to five years on average, but the "facts on the ground," to the extent that they can be ascertained today, appear far more variable. Few students, even with scholarship aid, would have been able to afford an ideal program.

Both Luther and Melanchthon gave considerable thought to the spiritual and intellectual qualities that should attend such a curriculum, and these reflections exercised a durable influence, as well. For Luther the key to all proper study of theology lay in a right personal

[102] Cf. Kenneth G. Appold, "Lutheran Orthodoxy and the Question of Confessional Absoluteness," in *Vanha ja nuori. Juhlakirja Simo Heinisen täyttäessä 60 vuotta* (Helsinki, 2003), pp. 170–85.

[103] Cf. Walter Sparn, *Wiederkehr*, passim. For a more encyclopedic overview of academic philosophy during the period, cf. Sparn, "Die Schulphilosophie in den lutherischen Territorien," in *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie*, ed. Helmut Holzhey, Wilhelm Schmidt-Biggemann, 4/1 (Basel, 2001), pp. 475–587.

approach, summed up by the tripartite formula of *oratio*, *meditatio*, and *tentatio* (prayer, meditation and temptation by adversaries).[104] In this way a theologian experienced theology's subject-matter spiritually, a pre-requisite to grasping its full meaning. By and large, that formula remained influential throughout the 17th (and even 18th) century. A burgeoning new literary genre, guidebooks on how to study theology, made frequent appeals to Luther's formula or to other specifications of proper spiritual and moral preparation, almost invariably calling for the integration of studies into a daily routine of prayer, private Scripture-reading, and reflection.[105] As theology's self-definition shifted during the 17th century and attention moved from theologians' personal faith to their acquisition of learning, direct invocations of the formula receded. Its influence remained ever-present, though, as theologians sought to reconcile their own *praxis pietatis* with the demands of an increasingly specialized and technical form of vocational education.[106]

Melanchthon's most prominent contribution to the theological curriculum came through his approach to biblical exegesis, epitomized by the *loci*-method. In an early (and oft-reprinted) letter on how to study theology, Melanchthon recommended reading the Bible with an empty notebook at hand, in order to keep track of the main theological points (or *loci*) as they emerged from the text.[107] The hermeneutical key to arranging those topics was provided by Paul's Epistle to the Romans, he went on to say, and the student might look to Melanchthon's own *Loci communes* for guidance. The result was a specific view of "doctrine" as a series of biblical focal points gathered by the lens of the reformers' soteriology. Later theologians such as David Chytraeus, whose guides to theology were formative for much of early Lutheranism and

---

[104] Luther drew the formula from Psalm 119; he employs it most notably in the 1539 preface to the German edition of his works: WA 50:657–61; LW 34:283–88.

[105] Cf. Nieden, *Einführung*; the first in-depth study of the genre.

[106] Generally speaking, theologians who adopt the new allopractic approach make less use of Luther's formula, with the notable exception of Abraham Calov, who uses it extensively (ibid., pp. 165–236). In the end the ensuing distinction between faith and theology yields the notion that theology's purpose could be achieved even by theologians who are not reborn or who have inadequate personal faith (*theologia non-renatorum*), a notion challenged by Pietists.

[107] Melanchthon's letter, presumably written in 1529, acquired the title "Brevis discendae theologiae ratio", and is printed in CR 2:455–61; MBW #854. For an analysis, cf. Nieden, *Erfindung*, pp. 69–79. On the influence of Melanchthon's exegetical approach, cf. Robert Kolb, "Teaching the Text: the Commonplace Method in Sixteenth Century Lutheran Biblical Commentary," *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 49 (1987), 571–585 [reprinted in Kolb, *Luther's Heirs*, no. X].

for Rostock in particular, make clear that Melanchthon's approach to learning went hand-in-hand with Luther's above-mentioned call to piety: the goal lies in molding a "learned piety," a faith informed and structured by recognition of the basic grammar of God's message. Melanchthon's guidelines were foundational for 17th-century Lutheran theology. Exegesis and dogmatics formed a tandem. Biblical commentaries of the period almost invariably culminate in a list of theological "points". Dogmatics textbooks took up those points, arranged them systematically and, at times, augmented them with controversial-theological references. As the guidebooks of Melanchthon, Chytraeus, and later theologians demonstrate, that task was not reserved to professors and their teaching but began with personal reading and reflection of students. Every student of theology was counseled to engage in the basic work of theological exegesis.

Andreae introduced a significant formal change to the curriculum. The reformers' approach was characterized both by its focus on molding the personal piety of their students, and by their vague account of where, exactly, such learning should take place. In their vision, it was at least possible—though not preferable—to acquire a theological education outside the university, and their recommendations appear geared as much to private, autodidactic use as to the curriculum. Both aspects changed decisively after 1580. For one thing, Andreae made unmistakeably clear that theological education was to happen at the university.[108] He vigorously condemned all forms of independent autodidacticism, a position reiterated by Lutherans throughout the 17th century. Secondly, Andreae set the tone for the later allopractic shift in theology by emphasizing the curriculum's role in preparing pastors for field ministry.[109] He called on them to create "*quasi coloniae*" of Lutheranism,[110] thereby lending the enterprise a sociopolitical dimension more in line with the confessionalizing aims of princes than with the personalized educational ethos of the reformers.

Andreae's move to locate theological education within the university proved precedent-setting. It was facilitated by the fact that the state's

[108] Andreae outlined these positions in his 1577 address to the Wittenberg faculty. They are largely incorporated into August's ordinances of 1580.

[109] Both Andreae and August initially required all professors of theology to possess previous parish experience, a requirement that was rescinded by the new orders in 1588. Leonard Hutter is the most notable case of an early Lutheran theologian who had no parish experience and confined his work to the academy.

[110] Jakob Andreae, *Instauratio*, fol. B2b. Cf. Appold, *Orthodoxie*, p. 19.

instruments for examining and accrediting pastors were almost always staffed by university professors, either *ex officio* or incidentally, thanks to dual ecclesial-academic appointments. While Andreae himself may have been guided by a vision of education that saw learning as a communal effort, the period's politicians saw other virtues in intensifying theology's institutionalization: it placed the process more firmly in the state's control. This was one more facet of confessionalization and the long-term trend toward princely absolutism.

A closer look at the curriculum reveals a subtext to that story, however, that cuts against the dominant grain. University theologians showed a persistent knack for pursuing their own interests and curricular priorities. They often did so without any obvious regard for practical applicability. Some of this came as an effect inherent to any communal intellectual experience: the life of the mind, enriched by a spirit of communication, begins to assert its own agenda. Early modern Lutheranism proved no exception to this, and faculties soon came to form cultures of their own, like off-shore colonies insulated from the reach of their ruler. They were insulated in part by the very utilitarianism with which princes had sought to confine them: the more "technical" education became, the more specialized its language. Nowhere is that more apparent than in the field of exegesis. Whereas Luther had argued for a *claritas Scripturae*, 17th-century Lutherans had raised exegesis to a specialized and highly refined science. The linguistic requirements alone would have excluded all but the most advanced theologians. Early Lutheranism's growing interest in history, particularly—but not exclusively—history of the church and its teachings, further raised the bar for participation in its theological discourse, as did the massive increase in philosophical prerequisites. As a consequence, theology came to resemble law in the specialized nature of its knowledge and language. The effect was ambiguous. On the one hand, it gave theologians more institutional power, but since those institutions were largely incapable of defining an independent agenda and remained in state hands, that fact cemented the theologian's bond to the princely court. Any "power" they gained was derived from the state and, finally, directed by the state. On the other hand, the more specialized theological discourse became, the more incomprehensible it was to outsiders. That made the inner life of the university more difficult to monitor, a fact echoed by the princes' regular complaints, usually uttered in the context of visitations, that professors ignore the demands of the curriculum, either by taking "too long" to get through their material, by neglecting prescribed subjects in

favor of "extraneous" things, or simply by failing to report the contents of their teaching to the court. In that regard theologians used their increasingly esoteric language to create a curtain behind which they could retain some measure of academic autonomy.

Such a need at least partly explains the period's great fondness for disputation. Traditionally, the curriculum saw two principal modes of instruction, lectures and disputations, with additional forms, such as homiletic training, devotional circles, and similar pious exercises circulating at the margins. As redefined by Andreae, disputation became an important tool for forging intellectual consensus in the community since it aired differences and allowed logically defensible positions to prevail. Disputations were a fixture of 17th-century university life;[111] they were used as part of the regular curriculum, taking place weekly and in some cases even daily; and they were also used to confer advanced degrees. Argument tended to follow strictly prescribed rules based on aristotelian logic and favored the use of syllogism. Professors employed disputations as preliminary exercises for further publications. Hardly a significant textbook of theology was published in this era without first having been held as a series of disputations. But disputation had another appeal, too: it was much more difficult to monitor than lecturing. While lectures were transcribed word-for-word by students, and those transcripts frequently demanded by the courts' censors, much of the disputation took place orally and, apart from the published theses, was never recorded. Tellingly, the princes' control mechanisms only targeted disputations when professors themselves disagreed publicly over the outcome, a fairly rare occurrence. As a result, disputations vastly enriched academic culture and the range of topics that theologians addressed was enormously varied. From the perspective of confessionalization, many were impractical.[112]

Theology and Doctrine

It would be impossible to give a full account of early Lutheran theology in just a few pages. That in itself is a welcome improvement over historical treatments of the past, which have taken a monolithic view

[111] Cf. Appold, *Orthodoxie*, passim.

[112] Significantly, the more overtly pragmatic among 17th-century Pietists attacked disputation with a vengeance—precisely because they considered it impractical and esoteric (as well as pretentious).

of Lutheran Orthodox theology. As soon as one moves beyond the better-known dogmatics-textbooks written during the era and regards the full spectrum of the period's theological production, including the thousands of published disputations, one encounters an almost overwhelming breadth and variety of doctrinal reflection, often along different trajectories and barely compatible with each other, but above all richly creative. A small minority of these works fit the classic pattern of "doctrine," understood as confessionally binding statements of truth. Many more were speculative and experimental. In fact, one of the period's more interesting accomplishments lies in its use of doctrinal norms to launch highly individual flights of theological inquiry and reflection. Commentaries on Scripture and on the Augsburg Confession provide two prominent examples of that creative tension and afford a glimpse "behind the curtain" of political expediency into a remarkably fertile world of the mind.

Scripture, understood as the inspired Word of God, stood in the center of early-modern Lutheran theology, as it had for the reformers. The notion of "verbal inspiration," about which much has been written subsequently,[113] tends to be both misunderstood and overemphasized. Not terribly controversial in its day,[114] it occupied at most a subsidiary position in early Lutheran systems of thought. Its primary function lay in securing the Bible's status as an epistemologically reliable foundation for the extraction of doctrine.[115] That having been established, Lutherans set about doing exegesis. Exegesis so pervaded the every-day life of a theologian from student-days onward that making general observations about its methods, style or contents in retrospect is difficult, especially

---

[113] Cf. Robert D. Preus, *The Inspiration of Scripture. A Study of the Theology of the Seventeenth Century Lutheran Dogmaticians* (Edinburgh, 1957); and *The Theology of Post-Reformation Lutheranism. Vol. 1: A Study of Theological Prolegomena* (St. Louis, 1970); Kenneth G. Appold, "Scriptural Authority in the Age of Lutheran Orthodoxy," in *The Bible in the History of the Church*, ed. John A. Maxfield (St. Louis, 2005), pp. 19–33.

[114] Conflicts with the newly emerging Copernican world-views were rare; some Lutheran theologians, such as Jesper Rasmussen Brochmand (1585–1652), theology professor at the University of Copenhagen, even sought to reconcile such views with that of the Bible.

[115] A secondary function, aimed at countering a Roman Catholic assertion that Scripture attained its authority by the church's authoritative interpretation, was less successful. As Lutheran exegesis became more "scientific," the circle of those who could be trusted to do it competently shrank and tended to be limited to trained theologians, who worked for the church. The difficulty of the Lutheran position became clear at the 1601 Regensburg Colloquy, where the Roman Catholic side forced a partial concession on this point. Cf. Appold, "Scriptural Authority," pp. 29–30.

since every work of theology in this day was, at bottom, a work of exegesis. The most direct products of early Lutheran exegesis, though, are commentaries and sermons. Even by today's standards, the level of philological and historical analysis remains impressive in many such works. Their hermeneutical approach, however, seems remarkably free, and, to an even greater extent than their Reformation-era predecessors, was far more open to allegorical and spiritual readings than later scholars often concluded. Sermons, in particular, make frequent use of allegory and seek to lead their hearers to a higher, "heavenly reality" hidden from earthward eyes.[116] Commentaries could be similarly inventive, but most tended to be more conventionally paedagogical. Building on Melanchthon's *loci*-method, commentaries typically included a series of theological or ethical axioms, which the author held to be the main lessons provided by the text. One of the most significant examples of 17th-century Lutheran biblical commentary is Abraham Calov's monumental *Biblica illustrata*, which covered all of Scripture from Genesis to Revelation.[117]

Next to Scripture, the *Confessio Augustana* of 1530 was the second-most common norm used to ground theological reflection. Virtually every university theology faculty offered courses, generally in the form of disputation colloquia, that examined and expounded upon the Augsburg Confession. (Interestingly, the Formula of Concord occupied a far less prominent position in such exercises, even during the 1580s.) As studies of such texts show,[118] commentaries on the *Augustana* had surprisingly little in common, aside from their mutual reference to the various articles of the Confession's text. In that regard they could all claim to be bound by and faithful to the Confession while at the same

---

[116] E.g., the sermons of Wittenberg theologian Paul Röber, *Außerlesene Zeit Predigten auff etliche hohe Fest- Sonn- und Land-Täge/wie auch sonderbare Gelegenheiten und vorgefallene Materien gerichtet*… (Frankfurt/M., 1666), examined by Appold, "Extra Academiam," passim. For a related examination of religious poetry of the era, cf. the essays collected in *Orthodoxie und Poesie*, ed. Udo Sträter (Leipzig, 2004). Not surprisingly, much of the more "otherwoldly" rhetoric, Röber's included, stems from a time when the "this-worldly" was decidedly unappealing, the Thirty-Years War.

[117] Abraham Calov, *Biblia veteris et novi testamenti illustrata*, 4 vols. (Wittenberg, 1672–1676); for an account of Calov's hermeneutics, cf. Volker Jung, *Das Ganze der Heiligen Schrift. Hermeneutik und Schriftauslegung bei Abraham Calov* (Stuttgart, 1999). At present, there remain painfully few studies of the period's exegetical works. Among those that treat 16th-century Lutheran exegesis are Robert Kolb's essays in *Luther's Heirs*, nos. X–XIII.

[118] Cf. Appold, *Orthodoxie*, passim.

time engaging in theological reflection that in most cases went far beyond anything contained in the *Augustana* and occasionally remind one of musical improvisations on a standard theme. Their treatment of ecclesiology is an illustrative example. Of the roughly one hundred ecclesiological treatises to emerge from the Wittenberg faculty between 1580 and 1700, and purporting to be readings of article VII of the Confession, no two were alike. Their approach to resolving some of the central ecclesiological issues facing early Lutheranism, e.g. how to define the universal church and describe its relation to particular churches, how to enumerate the *notae ecclesiae*, and how to cast the relation between *ecclesia visibilis* and *invisibilis* varied from text to text. Many of their positions were mutually exclusive (for some, the *ecclesia universalis* was visible, for others invisible, for example), and yet they coexisted harmoniously insofar as all could persuasively claim to be faithful to the Confession. Examples like this illustrate what went on behind the outward curtain of theological consensus. Its appearance—which was both politically expedient and ecclesially desirable—provided a cover for internal variety and a flexible, creative academic life.

Still, consensus was genuinely forged in a number of important doctrinal areas. Several of these went significantly beyond the thought of the reformers. Post-Reformation Lutherans developed notable doctrines of natural theology, for example, often placing these at the beginnings of their dogmatic systems and drawing heavily from their increasing work in philosophy. Similarly, the notion of a *tertius usus legis*—a third, paranetic use of the law that continues to guide Christian life after conversion—was not spelled out by Luther but developed broadly in Lutheran Orthodoxy on the basis of Melanchthon's formulation of this teaching. Concerted work in ethics went hand-in-hand with this, culminating in the first notable publications of this kind in Lutheranism.[119]

Unlike Reformation-era theological "breakthroughs" that so often sprang forth from a single mind, 17th-century doctrinal positions tended to emerge from contexts of disagreement and dialogue. Many of these were inter-confessional. Conflict with the Reformed, for example, yielded further reflection on the eucharistic doctrine of real presence and its Christological implications in formulations of the ancient

[119] For example, Friedrich Balduin, *De materia rarissime antehac enucleata, Casibus nimirum Conscientiae* (Wittenberg, 1628), or volume XI of Abraham Calov's *Systema locorum theologicorum*.

teaching of the "communication of attributes".[120] The latter, which revealed intra-Lutheran disagreements that were only partially resolved by the Formula of Concord, centered on discussions of the "ubiquity" of Christ's human nature. Another controversy that emerged from Lutheran-Reformed differences involved the doctrine of predestination. While the Reformed developed a doctrine of "double predestination," meaning that God decided in advance both who would be saved and who would not, Lutherans found the notion that God "willed" some people to hell inconsistent with what they described as God's universally valid offer of salvation: Christ died for *all*, even for those who eventually reject the offer. Some Lutherans, led by Samuel Huber, a Swiss refugee from Calvinism who became professor of theology in Wittenberg in the aftermath of the Crypto-Calvinist purges, went to the other extreme and taught a kind of universalism: God elects and calls all even though some reject his election and calling. A majority of Lutherans contested Huber's teaching and, after a period of heated controversy that cost Huber his job, crafted a middle position: God elects some, calls all, and saves those who do not actively reject his offer.[121] Once the Lutheran position was more or less firm, it again ran into conflict with the Reformed, now frequently implicating the doctrine of *vocatio*, or call to faith, as well.[122]

Theological controversy with Roman Catholics drew enormous sustenance from Robert Bellarmine's late-16th-century *Disputationes de controversiis christianae fidei*,[123] the Jesuit scholar's multi-volume treatment of contemporary "heresies". Needless to say, Lutherans occupied a

[120] For an account of how such conflicts interacted with confessionalization in the case of a leading late-16th-century Lutheran theologian, cf. Markus Matthias, *Theologie und Konfession. Der Beitrag Ägidius Hunnius (1550–1603) zur Entstehung einer lutherischen Religionskultur* (Leipzig, 2004).

[121] While human free will cannot contribute anything "synergistically" to salvation, it can act negatively and erect barriers of resistance to God's salvific action. Since God knows in advance who falls into each group, he is said to predestine the elect while foreknowing their faith—"*ex praevisa fide*". Cf. Rune Söderlund, *Ex praevisa fide: zum Verständnis der Prädestinationslehre in der lutherischen Orthodoxie* (Hannover, 1983). For an account of predestination prior to the Huber controversy, cf. Robert Kolb, *Bound Choice, Election, and Wittenberg Theological Method. From Martin Luther to the Formula of Concord* (Grand Rapids, 2005).

[122] Cf. Appold, *Calov*, pp. 117–29.

[123] Robert Bellarmine, *Disputationes de controversiis christianae fidei adversus huius temporis haereticos* (Ingolstadt, 1586–1593).

prominent position therein—and reacted in kind, publishing a multitude of defenses and counter-attacks. Much of this communication took place in a university context, with the Jesuits turning Ingolstadt into something of an Anti-Wittenberg. Though subsequent historiography has tended to dismiss these exchanges as "polemic," they make more sense when viewed in the context of the period's academic culture of disputation. A disciplined debate over controversial positions—and most of them did remain disciplined, despite the obvious excesses—was welcomed as part of the pursuit of truth. Major areas of contention revolved around ecclesiology in particular (such as questions of church authority, the papacy, "marks" of the true church, episcopal succession, and the nature of the "visible" church), but also included justification, anthropology and the doctrine of Scripture, among others. Among the more prominent engagements with the controversial theology of Bellarmine and his successors were Johann Gerhard's *Loci theologici* and the writings of figures like Leonhard Hutter, Jacob Martini and Jesper Rasmussen Brochmand, to name but a few.

Next to these two main confessional "competitors," Lutherans found themselves in theological conflict with a number of other adversaries, as well. These included the prominent intra-Lutheran controversy over "Syncretism" that led representatives from the faculties at Wittenberg, Leipzig, and Jena to draft an updated confession of faith tailored toward the issue, the *Consensus repetitus fidei vere lutheranae* of 1666. The document represents the only serious attempt of post-Concordian Lutheranism to fashion an additional confessional writing. The attempt failed to attract sufficient support beyond its original circle of authors.

A significant extra-confessional challenge was posed by the Polish Socinian movement, which had launched an aggressive mission into a number of German universities, including Wittenberg and, more successfully, Altdorf. The Socinians, named after the Italian religious thinker Fausto Sozzini, combined a number of elements of the Radical Reformation and Central European Unitarianism, including a rigorous biblicism that rejected the doctrine of the Trinity as unbiblical. Among Lutherans, few attacked Socinianism as vigorously as Abraham Calov, who hailed from the East Prussian frontier with Poland and made this conflict a priority within his polemical oeuvre. The controversy's main contribution to Lutheran theology came through Calov's biblical defense of the Trinity. Calov argued that while the Bible is verbally inspired by

God, God's Word is not always present in it "word-for-word"—κατα τον ρητον—but needs to be extracted theologically.[124] That was a significant concession that both softened Orthodox Lutheranism's biblicist tendencies and motivated numerous exegetical studies aimed at demonstrating the Bible's trinitarianism. It also accentuated the role of trained theologians as qualified biblical interpreters.

From its very beginnings Lutheranism contended with various brands of spiritualism, both from within and without the confession. Some of these occupied an ambiguous position with respect to Orthodoxy, as was the case with Johann Arndt. Arndt's devotional work *True Christianity* became one of the most widely read books by a Lutheran author of all time. It also integrated elements of medieval mysticism and, more controversially, influences of spiritualists like Paracelsus, Caspar Schwenckfeld, and Valentin Weigel, all of whom were situated unambiguously beyond the Lutheran pale. As the case with Arndt made clear, Lutheranism's relation to spiritualism remained complex and nuanced. On the one hand, it led to the rejection of certain teachings, such as the notion of an "inner Word" that worked independently of the visible—and legible—"outer Word," a position attributed to Hermann Rahtmann, a deacon in Danzig. Whether Rahtmann actually taught this, or was instead a victim of local church politics, remains less important than the fact that Lutheran theology insisted explicitly on identifying the inner workings of the Holy Spirit with the *verbum externum*. On the other hand, some spiritualist influences impacted positively on early Lutheranism. This was perhaps most evident in Orthodoxy's pneumatology, especially in its reflection on how the Holy Spirit enters human subjects. Coupled with the adoption of the analytic method, Lutheran theologians developed a systematic account of the Holy Spirit's action toward the believer, beginning with calling (*vocatio*), illumination, and conversion, and going on to include mystical union, renewal and sanctification. Mystical union was perhaps the most original of these *loci*. While originally aimed at rejecting a spiritualist notion that faith brings about an "essential" union of the believer with God, the doctrine quickly moved beyond this merely polemical stance and argued for a highly intimate mutual "approach" of the two. With a view toward eucharistic experience, 17th-century Lutheranism thus

[124] Appold, *Calov*, pp. 60–61.

developed a language of the believer's union with God, and of Christ's "inhabitation" of the believer.[125]

With so much emphasis on inter-confessional controversy, one should not overlook the ecumenical initiatives launched by early-modern Lutheranism. On a theoretical level, these produced a conception of "fundamental articles," formatively articulated by Nikolaus Hunnius (1585–1643) in his *Diaskepsis theologica* of 1626.[126] According to Hunnius and most of those who adopted some version of his methods, doctrine may be classed according to its utility in communicating the gospel message. Those teachings that need to be known in order to understand the message, such as doctrines of Christ's vicarious satisfaction, human sin, and others, are fundamental while those that can be ignored without impairing the grammar of justification are not. Importantly, ecumenical consensus need only be reached on fundamental articles.

While significant for the life of the church, doctrinal reflection was not the only form of scholarly activity emanating from Lutheran faculties of theology. As the 17th century progressed, professors devoted increasing attention to subjects that had no immediate bearing on preaching and pastoral practice, or even on controversial theology. Such "impractical" theology developed along several lines, some with a strong late-humanist flavor. Humanism's interest in history, for example, began to occupy a more prominent place both in the curriculum (as evidenced by disputations, in particular) and in publication. This yielded a vast number of historiographic works ranging from the mid-sixteenth-century *Chronicon Carionis*, the Magdeburg Centuries, and Johannes Sleidanus' *De quattuor summis imperiis*[127] to Johann Andreas Quenstedt's virtually unknown *Dialogus de patriis illustrium doctrina*,[128] Veit Ludwig von Seckendorf's *Compendium* of 1666,[129] or the anti-Orthodox church history of Pietist

---

[125] Cf. the essays collected in *Unio—Gott und Mensch in der nachreformatorischen Theologie: Referate des Symposiums der Finnischen Theologischen Literaturgesellschaft in Helsinki*, ed. Matti Repo and Rainer Vinke (Helsinki, 1996), particularly the volume's historical study by Theodor Mahlmann, "Die Stellung der unio cum Christo in der lutherischen Theologie des 17. Jahrhunderts," pp. 72–199.

[126] Nikolaus Hunnius, Διασκεψις *theologica de fundamentali dissensu doctrinae Evangelicae-Lutheranae, et Calvinianae, seu Reformatae* (Wittenberg, 1626).

[127] Johannes Sleidanus, *De quattuor summis imperiis libri tres*… (Strasbourg, 1556).

[128] Johann Andreas Quenstedt, *Dialogus De Patriis Illustrium Doctrina Et Scriptis Virorum, Omnium Ordinum Ac Facultatum, Qui ab initio Mundi per universum terrarum Orbem usque ad annum reparatae Gratiae M.DC. claruerunt* (Wittenberg, 1654). The work attempts to account for all theologians through the history of the world.

[129] Veit Ludwig von Seckendorf, *Compendium Historiae Ecclesiasticae* (Gotha, 1666).

Gottfried Arnold.[130] The period's historical sensibility deeply affected theological argument. Appeals to a *consensus veterum* were a standard part of 17th-century theology and the historical construction of such a consensus, generally accomplished by collecting an enormous (and frequently ecumenical) range of quotations, was a central component of a theologian's work. This partly explains why a learned theologian like Abraham Calov needed twelve volumes to finish his dogmatics.

An entirely new subject of academic study emerged in the 1620s. Balthasar Meisner, writing a theological system that was cut short by his premature death in 1626, held a series of disputations on "religion".[131] While Meisner draws on some aspects of the thomistic tradition, his disputations are revolutionary in that they posit a general definition of religion, of which Christianity is a specific case. He defines religion, on the one hand, as involving an "interior affect of the heart," whose principal efficient cause, on the other, is God. In religion God communicates with humans, teaching them how to serve and honor him, and leads them to spiritual union with himself. For Meisner Christianity (as shaped by the Lutheran confessions) remains the only true religion in fact, but his theory of religion assumes the kind of formal neutrality that would later come to be associated with the Enlightenment. With these disputations Meisner set an important precedent that was taken up by his successors, most notably Calov, in their own systems.

Meisner's general definition of religion seems to have been part of a larger, long-overlooked, and poorly understood trend in 17th-century Lutheran thought. A growing historical sensibility, further fueled by biblical studies, yielded a host of works of cultural history and studies of other religions. Evidence for this trend—and for its use of extra-Christian source material—comes from library acquisitions, among other places. Wittenberg's mid-17th-century librarian, the theologian and philologist Andreas Sennert, for example, published his strategy for expanding the university's holdings to include a considerable collection of rabbinic material, among other things.[132] Theologians took note and

---

[130] Gottfried Arnold, *Unpartheyische Kirchen- und Ketzer-Historie vom Anfang des Neuen Testaments biss auff das Jahr Christi 1688* (Frankfurt/M., 1699/1700).

[131] Balthasar Meisner, *De religione et eius articulis generatim consideratis* [19 Disputations] (Wittenberg, 1625–1626). For a more detailed account of this work, cf. Appold, *Orthodoxie*, pp. 242–65.

[132] Andreas Sennert, *Bibliotheca orientalis, sive Idea pleni systematis linguarum orientalium, maxime Ebraeae matris, Chaldaeae, Syrae, Arabicaeque, filiarum utpote trium primigenarum nobilissimarumque nec non Rabbinismi* (Wittenberg, 1656). Sennert published a catalogue of some

made use of the new books. Sennert's contemporary, Johann Andreas Quenstedt, is a particularly interesting example. Long associated solely with his dogmatics textbook, which may be the least original of his major publications, Quenstedt authored scores of smaller works, many as disputations on the history of religious rites and practices. These often involved a comparative-religion approach, as, for example in his studies on the history of public prayer, rites of baptism and initiation, or ancient burial practices. Quenstedt consistently adopted a descriptive, rather than normatively prescriptive, viewpoint in these works, placing accounts of ancient Christian and non-Christian rituals side-by-side.[133] The works reveal no dogmatic or confessional interest at all.

Conclusion

The call for a "practical" theology, issued in concert by both the reformers and the early-modern princes, was a defining context for post-Reformation Lutheranism's university theology. Ironically, it is also the main criterion by which later historians judged that theology. Responding to Pietist critics like Gottfried Arnold, who in 1699 excoriated his teachers' thought for being static and impractical (and thereby, whether knowingly or not, echoed the voices of princes a century before), even those who have sought to rehabilitate Orthodoxy have approached the task by trying to prove Arnold wrong. That means they have tended to highlight Orthodoxy's dedication to praxis, both in its definition of theology and in its attention to piety. But Arnold's critique was itself shaped by expectations born of the age of confessionalization and, whether wittingly or not, reflected its ethos. Reading the 17th century back through Arnold's—and other Pietists'—lens of interpretation, historians have made Lutheran Orthodox theologians appear far more complicit with the princely program of confessionalization than is warranted. To be sure, many academic theologians of the post-Reformation period did contribute to confessionalization. As appointees of the state, they often executed their rulers' programs and served as instruments of the state's

---

of the library's acquisitions, *Bibliothecae academiae Wittebergensis publicae*… (Wittenberg, 1678).

[133] Cf. Appold, *Orthodoxie*, pp. 117–22. Quenstedt's most influential work of this kind, published repeatedly well into the 18th century, was his treatise on ancient burial rites: *Sepultura veterum, svie de antiquis ritibus sepulchralibus* (Wittenberg, 1647–1648; [2]1660).

institutional arm, whether in consistories, advisory roles, or even simply as educators. That was even the case less directly, or less voluntarily, when parts of their own agenda, perhaps more aptly described as one of Christianization, coincided with the princes' aims.

Yet there were also important differences. These became visible wherever tensions between universities and courts arose. From the princes' viewpoint, university theologians were not always good subjects. And much of what the academics said and did was woefully impractical. By its very nature as a pursuit of truth, scholarly discourse demands freedom—freedom from outside control, but also freedom from the dictates of immediate application or "relevance". In that regard post-Reformation universities were not ideal venues for scholarship. Late-medieval developments in the history of education, abetted by the Wittenberg reformers' appeals to princely supervision, imposed a host of controls on the universities that, by and large, were intrusive and stifling. Academic freedom as we understand it today was severely compromised. The fact that significant scholarship took place in spite of this is a credit to the men who worked in those institutions and who managed to carve out a measure of liberty for their academic community. Doing so meant, on the one hand, absorbing the overall spirit of pragmatism and dedication to serving the needs of society, and taking ownership of it through their own well-publicized programs of theology. On the other hand, it also meant creating spaces that were insulated from the demands of the day. On an institutional level scholars resisted the state's control by simply failing to report what they did, as in the case of professors who refused to send in transcripts of their lectures, or by seeking ways to circumvent censorship. On a more subtle level academics began to cultivate a technical language that rendered lay supervision more difficult. They developed a fondness for abstraction and for thought systems marked by high levels of interiority—pensive, inwardly reflective structures that to many readers seem "static". They employed philosophy as a regulative discipline, in part to assert an internal grammar to their work, a "logic" whose immanent demands overruled those of politically expedient practicality. Trends of that kind were reinforced by scholars' growing culture of communication with colleagues in other states, countries, and even of other confessions. They were nourishing a world of the mind (sometimes tellingly described as a "republic of letters") often out of step with the world of the court.

In that regard the most intimate part of the scholar's identity, a longing to find and speak the truth, made it all but impossible that

early-modern academic theologians could be reduced to serving their political masters as simple "agents of confessionalization". At the very least, an assessment of their life and teaching will need to remain nuanced and complex, taking into account the cultural and political pressures within which they worked, but also uncovering the less obvious manner in which they pursued their own intellectual agendas. To a scholar, that pursuit seems timeless.

PREACHING IN LUTHERAN PULPITS IN THE AGE OF CONFESSIONALIZATION

Mary Jane Haemig and Robert Kolb

The Place of Preaching in the Lutheran Reformation

From both historical and theological perspectives, preaching was central to the Lutheran Reformation and the churches that followed Luther's call for reform. To be sure, Mark Edwards correctly observes that print enabled Luther's message to command attention across Germany and Europe more quickly than anyone's ideas had been propagated previously.[1] Preachers and many lay people often got knowledge of that message through books and tracts. However, Edwards also calls the Reformation "an oral event".[2] Robert Scribner labeled the sermon "the formal means of communication" of Reformation thought and practice and the Reformation itself "first and foremost a powerful preaching revival".[3] Often (in German lands, at least) a preacher introduced his reformatory insights in some form or other before Luther's writings arrived in a place.[4]

Throughout the 17th-century German culture remained primarily oral even though the printing press altered public life, particularly intellectual discourse, profoundly. This fact alone makes the study of preaching critical for a proper assessment of Lutheran ecclesiastical culture not only in the earliest years of Luther's reform but throughout the entire early modern period. The dogmatic works of the 17th century have commanded disproportionate attention from nineteenth and twentieth scholars of the period; preaching, however, stood at the heart of Lutheran parish practice. The culture of Lutheran lands and

---

[1] Mark U. Edwards, Jr., *Printing, Propaganda, and Martin Luther* (Berkeley, 1994), pp. 172, 7.

[2] Ibid., pp. 37, 11.

[3] "Oral Culture and the Transmission of Reformation Ideas," in *The Transmission of Ideas in the Lutheran Reformation*, ed. Helga Robinson-Hammerstein (Dublin, 1989), p. 84.

[4] This was not everywhere the case; see David P. Daniel, "Publishing the Reformation in Habsburg Hungary," in *Habent sua fata libelli. Books Have their Own Destiny. Essays in honor of Robert V. Schnucker*, ed. Robin B. Barnes et al. (Kirksville MO, 1998), pp. 47–60.

particularly their ecclesiastical sub-culture in wake of the Wittenberg Reformation cannot be understood apart from the sermon, one of the chief media that addressed the consciousness of the common people and their leaders. Study of sermons and preaching provides critical insight into how the teachings of the Lutheran reformation were transmitted to all social classes and how the faith of the people, as the heart of their understanding of reality, took form in this period. Therefore, proper estimate of post-Reformation Lutheran church life depends on more research into Lutheran preaching between 1550 and 1675, a field that only recently has elicited more intensive and extensive study.

At the heart of Luther's reordering of ecclesiastical life and his perception of how God works in his world stood the "living voice of the gospel," the orally-transmitted word. Theologically, Luther believed, in the words of the apostle Paul, that "faith comes from hearing" God's Word, specifically the gospel that bestows forgiveness of sins, life and salvation on its hearers (Rom. 10:17).[5] For Luther, God the Holy Spirit used the sermon to convict the hearer of sin through the preaching of God's requirements for human performance and the human being's relationship with him (labeled "law" in Luther's hermeneutic); the Holy Spirit then gives the hearer faith in the promise of forgiveness and confers a new identity upon the sinner, child of God ("gospel" in Luther's technical terms). This takes place through the presentation of God's message in oral, written, and sacramental forms of his Word. Preaching did not simply describe God's will or exhort; rather, the preacher's voice conveyed the voice of God, calling to the sinner, admonishing her to lead a God-pleasing life, chastening her and granting her forgiveness and new life.

Lecturing to his students on Genesis 1 in 1535, Luther drew a parallel between God's creative Word in that chapter and his speaking through his people in the everyday life of the Christian congregation. Sin had brought chaos and emptiness, corresponding to what Genesis 1:2 describes, into human life. Out of that "nothingness" God spoke at the beginning, bringing all reality into being. In the "nothingness of sin" God speaks his word, based on Christ's death and resurrection, and through it accomplishes a new creation (2 Cor. 4:6). Turning wicked

---

[5] Fred W. Meuser, *Luther the Preacher* (Minneapolis, 1983), O.C. Edwards Jr., *A History of Preaching* (Nashville, 2004), pp. 283–303, Beth Kreitzer, "The Lutheran Sermon" in *Preachers and People in the Reformations and Early Modern Period*, ed. Larissa Taylor (Leiden, 2000), pp. 35–63.

hearts to God through preaching is "something which is also brought about by the Word—as a new work of creation".[6] Lutheran preaching accomplishes God's intentions for humankind, enacting his gift of salvation in the lives of the hearers. Without a reform of preaching, no Lutheran Reformation would have occurred.

Medieval Christian practice focused above all on human performance of ritual. The lack of adequate personnel at the beginning of the Christian mission and the failure to develop widespread education, particularly for parish clergy, resulted in a kind of Christianity that fit itself into the framework and rhythms of traditional religions. Germanic tribal religion had relied largely on ritual to insure some taming of divine powers from whomever or whatever they might stem. Recent research has shown that popular preaching rose considerably in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries as a complement more than a counterbalance to ritual aspects of medieval religious practice, but it remained largely limited to towns, where lay people often endowed special positions alongside parish structures for regular preaching. On the village level mendicant preachers traveled only occasionally through the countryside; some monasteries also provided opportunities to hear preaching for nearby peasants.[7] Robert Scribner notes that "the scope and intensity of the Reformation preaching revival, as well as its emphasis on the Bible as the sole source of religious truth" set it apart from 15th-century efforts at fostering more and better preaching.[8] Luther recognized that human reliance on the performance of ritual to appease God, both in the realm of salvation and in the realm of his providential intervention in the faithful's behalf, struck at the heart of what he considered the biblical view of God as a Creator, who expressed his love for his human creatures in his Word. The Wittenberg circle continued to recognize the importance of ritual,[9] dedicated much effort to reforming it properly, but subordinated it to the transmission of the gospel through sermon and other forms of the Word. Luther and his colleagues revised rituals to make certain that they delivered the power of God's Word to the people.

---

[6] LW 1:16–17; WA 42:13,31–14,22.
[7] See Kreitzer, "Sermon," pp. 35–39.
[8] "Oral Culture," pp. 84–85.
[9] Susan C. Karant-Nunn, *The reformation of ritual. An interpretation of early modern Germany* (London, 1997).

Therefore, Luther and his followers in the subsequent century and a half took the task of preaching very seriously. It served as the primary means for indigenizing a new way of practicing the Christian faith, not merely as one more reform of its moving parts. As a leading member of the Augustinian Eremite house in Wittenberg, Luther had preached often throughout the 1510s; thereafter, as a colleague of his pastor, Johannes Bugenhagen, he often took the pulpit, in services during the week, particularly when Bugenhagen left Wittenberg to serve as consultant in the introduction of Wittenberg-style reforms elsewhere. Luther's sermons often considered a biblical text verse by verse; more commonly Luther focused on a phrase or a verse or two that he thought expressed the central point of the text. Luther and subsequent Lutheran preachers rejected the medieval emphases on preaching "the deeds of Christ, the imitation of Christ, and the praise of Christ,"[10] basing the sermon's content instead on Scripture interpreted and applied to parishioners' lives within the framework of the distinction of law and gospel. In his *Formula for Public Worship* (1523) Luther advised pastors to preach for about a half hour, within a service lasting about an hour and warned against "overloading or wearying souls".[11]

Luther not only attended to the preaching task himself. Early on in the reform movement, in 1521–1522, he turned to the task of providing helps for priests who now wished to proclaim the gospel as they found it in Luther's writings. He adapted the medieval genre of the postil, a book of sermons on the lessons appointed for Sundays and festivals, to his purposes and made it into a program of continuing education for pastors. His original effort in a volume of sermons for Advent and Christmas grew into his *Church Postil* and his *House Postil*, both edited by students. These volumes served not only preachers but also parents who wished to provide family devotions for their children and servants. They also served more than fifty of Luther's disciples between 1540 and 1700 as a model for similar collections of model sermons of their own.[12]

---

[10] John W. O'Malley, "Content and Rhetorical Forms in 16th-Century Treatises on Preaching," in *Renaissance Eloquence: Studies in the Theory and Practice of Renaissance Rhetoric* ed. James J. Murphy (Berkeley, 1983), p. 243.

[11] WA 12:36,13–17; LW 53:12.

[12] On the Reformation adaption of the genre and its practice in the 16th and 17th centuries, see Hans-Henrik Krummacher, *Der junge Gryphius und die Tradition. Studien zu den Perikopensonetten und Passionsliedern* (Munich, 1976), pp. 69–164.

Luther's original postil, composed in 1521–1522, contained sermons never preached but written simply as patterns for others. His later similar works stemmed from notes taken on sermons his students had heard. As important as his pericopal texts, much of his corpus of published preaching was not on the lessons appointed for the church year. He published many sermons treating other texts (including series on entire biblical books, such as Matthew and John, on which he preached during the Wednesday and Saturday services in Wittenberg) or instructive homilies on topics based only more loosely on specific texts. In 1537 Elector Johann Friedrich appointed Luther's student Georg Rörer to be the reformer's official amanuensis. Rörer's notes and the notes of others supplied editors with material that printers grabbed eagerly, swelling the volume of Luther's total published sermons before the end of the century.

As important as moral exhortation remained in his sermons, Luther's revolution in homiletical method centered on the proclamation of God's law and gospel, God's expectations and demands, as well as God's promises. Melanchthon aided in developing this new hermeneutic and incorporated it into his rhetorical and homiletical texts. Though Luther never wrote a treatise or handbook on preaching, his emphasis on law and gospel as God's two ways of dealing with humans decisively shaped Lutheran preaching. A Lutheran sermon was to proclaim clearly both, with the application of the gospel's life-giving power the ultimate goal. Nonetheless, Luther emphasized from early on that preaching not only "teaches" or delivers God's call to repentance and his gift of a new relationship with himself; it also provides "exhortation," help for hearers to carry on the Christian life of trust in God's mercy, dependence on his promises, and obedience to his plan for human living. From the beginning of the Reformation Luther was deeply concerned to cultivate "new obedience," the "fruits of faith" in his hearers and readers, and he was very realistic in recognizing the continual need for such instruction in a life that never escapes the plague of sinful desire.[13] Some contemporary scholars misunderstand Luther's focus on good works and moral obedience as the chief point of his message, suggesting that Lutheran preaching aimed above all at the moral and social disciplining manifest in the preaching of the

[13] See the introduction to his *Wartburg Postil*, entitled "A Brief Instruction on What to Look for and Expect in the Gospels," WA 10,1,1:8–18, LW 35:113–24.

law. But it is a misunderstanding of Lutheran preaching to focus only on this aspect and not see that, along with his attempts to improve the Christian "living" of the faith, Luther counted as the measure of his success his cultivation of the hearers' believing, praying, their ability to suffer and preparedness to die in faith.[14] Of course, agents of the public ideology that supports political order in every society contribute to the enforcement of public discipline. That such results arose from Lutheran preaching is not unexpected. However, the intention and the impact of this proclamation differed from the rather narrow point of view represented in some contemporary scholarly analysis, anchored in modern perceptions. Extant sermon texts reveal that calls for obedience to God's commands, as understood by the preachers, reflecting their cultural values, stemmed from their assessment of reality as bound to God's plan for human living. That they interpreted it within the thinking of their day, influenced as it was by fears of disorder and disaster, by the fragility of life when it was threatened by such disruption and danger, is not surprising. Directing and disciplining flowed inevitably from the preachers' primary task and perceived responsibility, to deliver the new life for which Christ died and rose.

In Lutheran thinking, preaching not only creates individuals anew; it also creates the church. The Holy Spirit, using the means of preaching, "calls, gathers, enlightens, and sanctifies" the whole Christian church on earth.[15] The church thus was a creation of the Word rather than a supervisor or arbiter over it. Without the preaching of the Word, an assembly could not claim to be church. For this reason, too, Luther's disciples counted preaching as the critical center of ecclesiastical life.

This obviously affected worship practices. Lutherans believed that proper worship could not take place without the realization that the congregations's central and most important activity is God's speaking in preaching. In his early work concerning worship, Luther wrote, "…when God's Word is not preached, one had better neither sing nor read, or even come together".[16] Luther believed that worship should never occur without preaching. For Luther and his followers the worship

[14] "Aber nu ists/Gott lob/dahin komen/das man vnd weib/jung vnd alt/den Catechismum weis/Vnd wie man gleuben/leben/beten/leiden/vnd sterben sol…". "Warnung an seine lieben Deutschen," 1531, WA 30,3:317, 32–34, LW 47:52.

[15] Cf. Augsburg Confession 7, BC, pp. 42/43, BSLK, p. 61; and Luther's Small Catechism, Creed, Third Article, BC, pp. 355–56, BSLK, pp. 511–12.

[16] Martin Luther, "Concerning the Order of Public Worship," (1523), WA 12:35; LW 53, 11.

service (*Gottesdienst*) was primarily about God serving the people through the proclamation of the Word and the distribution of the sacrament. The prayer, praise, and thanksgiving of the people came in response to what God did first.

In general, Luther's students and his heirs throughout the hundred-fifty years following his death held to the reformer's understanding of God's Word as the instrument of his condemning and saving power, operating through the speaking of his Word in sermons, absolution, conversation, in Scripture and devotional literature of all kinds, and in the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's Supper.

Sources for the study of Lutheran preaching 1550–1675

The Occasion and Place of Lutheran Sermons

Lutheran preaching took place for the most part in the context of congregational life; sermons formed one half of a conversation between pastors and their people. Pastors recognized, implicitly and explicitly, that the focus of their faith had shifted from their performance of ritual directed toward God to the conversation initiated by God to which their people and they respond.[17] These pastors generally followed Luther's model of doctrine and exhortation, delivering instruction for Christian living on the basis of the call for repentance and proclamation of new life through forgiveness of sins on the basis of Christ's death and resurrection. Their source for the message was Scripture. They followed Luther in defining the assignment to which God had called them as that of mediating the conversation between God and the people of their congregations and that God's Word continues his creative and re-creative work as his living and active tool.[18] With him they believed that God's Word stands authoritatively in Scripture even though many did not hesitate to cite the tradition of the church in their sermons

[17] Patrick T. Ferry, "Preaching on Preaching. Postils, the *Predigtamt*, and the People in the Lutheran Reformation, 1546–1600," *Logia* 3 (1994), 35–44; Bernhard Liess, *Johann Herrmann (1585–1647): Prediger in Schlesien zur Zeit des Dreißigjärigen Krieges* (Münster, 2003), pp. 154–64; Alexander Bitzel, *Anfechtung und Trost bei Sigismund Scherertz. Ein lutherischer Theologe im Dreißigjärigen Krieg* (Göttingen, 2002), pp. 43–49; Norbert Haag, *Predigt und Gesellschaft. Die Lutherische Orthodoxie in Ulm, 1640–1740* (Mainz, 1992), pp. 99–106.

[18] Ibid., pp. 17–18.

to support their interpretation of Scripture.[19] Whether the text always matched the task they perceived necessary for a given situation they addressed is another question, but in principle they always found some biblical basis for addressing the needs of the congregation in their sermons. As for Luther, for preachers in the century and a half after his death hymn texts were also carefully entwined with preaching.[20] The texts of hymns could even serve as texts for preaching though Bible passages hovered behind the hymn text in such cases.[21]

Addressing their people's needs meant, first, that pastors strove to preach law to their people in order to call them to repentance. Sometimes they probably spoke of sins that did not necessarily plague their own parishioners, but the "law" part of their conversation usually can be trusted to reflect real problems in their villages or towns. The gospel usually took standard biblical form, reflecting or repeating the images and illustrations of God's saving work in Christ that the Wittenberg reformers had bequeathed them, but frequently with imaginative adaptations from their own situations as well. Instruction regularly engaged practical issues and how to live in new obedience to God's will in the home, marketplace, field, and shop. Susan Boettcher's examination of Cyriakus Spangenberg's sermons preached to miners in Mansfeld county in the 1550s–1570s finds that he tailored his preaching to the situation of his mining community and particularly emphasized the care of souls. Even though some elements in his preaching might be seen as aiding "social disciplining," his discipline applied to everyone in society, not just the lower social classes; rulers and leaders in society had obligations, he insisted. Spangenberg "did attempt to use his sermons to provide spiritual answers to the specific daily problems of his community by addressing the perceived quotidian problems and worries of his parishioners. We can never know what any congregation actually heard and internalized from any sermons. This problem aside, the 'cura animarum' of Spangenberg's sermons thus extended, at least

[19] See Robert Kolb, "Patristic Citation as Homiletical Tool in the Vernacular Sermon of the German Late Reformation," in *Die Patristik in der Bibelexegese des 16. Jahrhunderts*, ed. David C. Steinmetz (Wiesbaden, 1999), pp. 151–79; Liess, *Herrmann*, pp. 181–85.

[20] Christopher Boyd Brown, *Singing the Gospel. Lutheran Hymns and the Success of the Reformation* (Cambridge, MA, 2005), esp. pp. 76–129.

[21] E.g., Cyriakus Spangenberg, *Cythara Lutheri*… (Erfurt, 1570); Simon Pauli, *Ausslegung der Deutschen Geistlichen Lieder*…*von Herrn Doctore Martino Luthero*… (Magdeburg, 1588); Michael Julius, *Sechs kurtze Predigten: In welchen das herrliche scho[e]ne Kinderliedt*…*zu lesen* (Erfurt, 1589) and *Christus rediviivs*… (Erfurt, 1602).

rhetorically, past the fulfillment of the formal obligation to proclaim the Gospel and explored the problems of his entire local mining community".[22] Sabine Holtz's assessment of preaching in Württemberg also concludes that it was less determined by dogmatic strictures than by Scripture and particularly the catechism that the people were supposed to be carrying in their heads, as their personal summary of Scripture; the sermons sought to integrate the preacher's message with their experiences to connect daily life to the true faith.[23]

The task of preaching remained at the center of the pastor's life. Typically, parish routines, especially in towns, required some two hundred sermons per year. In Joachimsthal, Bohemia, Johannes Mathesius served as city preacher from 1542 to 1565, mounting the pulpit an estimated five thousand times; some fifteen hundred of his sermons appeared in print, most posthumously.[24] In larger towns the pastoral staff shared as many as forty appointed services each week (though not all required a sermon necessarily). Estimates of sermon length vary from less than half an hour to one or two hours. Pericopes—the appointed lessons for each week or festival—gave preachers the basis for using the church year as a frame for their proclamation, and they were sensitive to its seasons.[25] The chief service of the week occurred on Sunday morning; most ecclesiastical constitutions prescribed the pericopal gospel lesson appointed for that particular Sunday for that service. In addition, catechetical services often occurred Sunday afternoons; other services on Sunday and throughout the week provided opportunities for worship and proclamation.[26]

---

[22] "The Rhetoric of 'Seelsorge' for Miners in the Sermons of Cyriakus Spangenberg," in *Frömmigkeit—Theologie—Frömmigkeitstheologie: Contributions to European CH Festschrift für Berndt Hamm*, ed. Gudrun Litz, Heidrun Munzert, and Roland Liebenberg (Leiden, 2005), pp. 453–66. It should be noted that the obdurate adherence of a significant number of Spangenberg's parishioners to his concept of original sin, condemned by Mansfeld authorities, for a generation after his departure from Mansfield, suggests that his preaching and entire ministry had a strong impact upon some, see Robert Christman, "Heretics in Luther's Homeland: The Controversy over Original Sin in Late 16th-Century Mansfeld," (Ph.D. diss., University of Arizona, 2004).

[23] Sabine Holtz, *Theologie und Alltag. Lehre und Leben in den Predigten der Tübinger Theologen 1550–1750* (Tübingen, 1993), esp. 187–313.

[24] Georg Loesche, *Johannes Mathesius*, (1895, rpt. Nieuwkoop 1971), 2:33. Mathesius may have prepared some sermons for print that he had not preached, but that appears not to have been his usual practice.

[25] E.g., Mary Jane Haemig, "16th-Century Preachers on Advent as a Season of Proclamation or Preparation," *LQ* 16 (2002), 125–52.

[26] Albrecht Beutel, "Predigt VIII," TRE 27 (1997), 300–01.

Although almost all Lutheran preachers mounted pulpits before a collection of ordinary—"the common"—people, their hearers almost always included leaders in the villages, and sometimes noble families or even princely families as well, and in the towns artisans and merchants, patricians and the poor. At least one special class of preachers, those who preached at princely court, must continue to command attention.[27]

The Genre of Lutheran Preaching and Published Sermons

Lutheran preaching was above all pericopal preaching. Most sermons disappeared as memories faded, the outlines or written texts perishing at the whim of pastor or pastor's wife. Nonetheless, impressions of what pericopal preaching aimed to accomplish and how it was created remain in the postils of the period, some three dozen written by German Lutheran preachers following Luther's model before the end of the 16th century and a significant number in the 17th. Church orders advised or mandated that preachers have Luther's postils and or another collection available to them. Library lists from this era indicate that most preachers owned several postils.[28] These postils influenced preaching in several ways. Sometimes in their introductions the authors explained their theory and practice of preaching, offering explicit guidelines. In all cases, the printed sermons themselves offered examples of how to preach on a text. Postils were intended to help preachers, but particularly those in the vernacular became regular reading among laity. Some postils seem designed for lay use.[29] For pastors, they were not intended simply to provide a ready-made message. As Patrick Ferry has noted,

---

[27] See especially the very helpful studies of Martin Sommer, e.g. *Die lutherischen Hofprediger in Dresden. Grundzüge ihrer Geschichte und Verkündigung im Kurfürstentum Sachsen* (Stuttgart, 2006), and *Gottesfurcht und Fürstenherrschaft. Studien zum Obrigkeitsverständnis Johann Arndts und lutherischer Hofprediger zur Zeit der altprotestantischen Orthodoxie* (Göttingen, 1988).

[28] Hans-Christoph Rublack, "Lutherische Predigt und soziale Wirklichkeiten," in *Die lutherische Konfessionalisierung in Deutschland*, ed. Hans-Christoph Rublack (Gütersloh, 1992), pp. 345–48; Luise Schorn-Schütte, *Evangelische Geistlichkeit in der Frühneuzeit. Deren Anteil an der Entfaltung frühmoderner Staatlichkeit und Gesellschaft* (Gütersloh, 1996), pp. 217–21.

[29] Jonathan Strom, *Orthodoxy and Reform: The Clergy in 17th-Century Rostock* (Tübingen, 1999), p. 237, treats Heinrich Müller's postil, *Apostolische Schluß-Kette und Krafft-Kern…* (Frankfurt/Main, 1667); cf. Thomas Kaufmann, *Universität und lutherische Konfessionalisierung. Die Rostocker Theologieprofessoren und ihr Beitrag zur theologischen Bildung und kirchlichen Gestaltung im Herzogtum Mecklenburg zwischen 1550 und 1675* (Gütersloh, 1997), pp. 538–71.

"postils were meant to be study tools and not sermon substitutes".[30] Citing several postil writers, Ferry notes

> Ultimately the intention of these homiletical helps, especially for unseasoned preachers, was not that they should become a crutch. Rather, postils were to be a guide for pastors so that eventually they would feel confident enough in their own abilities to prepare a Christian sermon on a pericope without aid.… Young preachers in particular were urged to guard against both underpreparation and overpresumption in their sermon work. There was no replacement for meticulous study in preparing to preach to a congregation of hearers. Consulting a postil was supposed to be only a part of the process; it was certainly not the replacement for individual exegesis…[31]

Most of these collections underwent careful editing before they appeared posthumously in print, but that of Joachim Mörlin, superintendent in Braunschweig and finally in Prussia after serving parishes in Arnstadt, Göttingen, and Königsberg, edited by his son, Hieronymus, reproduces notes left behind from each of his posts, stretching over nearly three decades. These rough outlines and drafts provide a rare glimpse into the shifts in concern and style of one preacher.[32] Even edited sermons betrayed marks of orality, however. Few if any were published exactly as preached; published texts presumably had undergone a process of improvement and refinement, but to a large extent they seem to replicate what happened in at least some pulpits.[33]

Lutheran postils became so important for parish life that the German-Baltic pastor Georg Mancelius composed his own in Latvian for the pastors in Livonia and Courland. Mancelius studied in Rostock, 1612–1615, thereafter serving as a parish pastor in several parishes before appointment as instructor in Greek at the gymnasium in Dorpat (Tartu) that became a university in 1632. After 1638 he served at the court of the duke of Courland. In the year he died, 1654, his *Latvian Postil*

---

[30] Ferry, "Preaching," p. 37.

[31] Ibid. Susan C. Karant-Nunn finds sermons of Braunschweig pastors "tediously similar expositions" to those in Luther's and apparently other postils, *Reformation of ritual*, p. 126. Her suggestion on the basis of a visitors' report in Braunschweig-Calenberg-Göttingen from 1625, complaining of failure to follow "the superintendents' directions in official matters," that sermons were dictated to be read by central authorities is not documented here and unlikely as a general rule.

[32] Joachim Mörlin, *Postilla* (Erfurt, 1587).

[33] Robert Kolb, "Georg Major as Preacher," in *Georg Major (1502–1574), ein Theologe der Wittenberger Reformation*, eds. Irene Dingel and Günther Wartenberg (Leipzig, 2005), pp. 97–98 (93–121).

appeared in print, "the first major original prose text in Latvian".[34] It employs Ramo-Melanchthonian developments in rhetoric and reiterates the theology Mancelius had learned at Rostock. Distinguishing law and gospel in each sermon, Mancelius addressed the troubled world of the mid-17th century he experienced in the midst of war, disease, and Counter-Reformation in the Baltic. Mancelius' postil succeeded in translating the thought of Johann Gerhard and other Orthodox authors he read into the life of Latvian peasants and town dwellers.[35]

A special form of the postil endeavored to provide young people with a guide to the pericopal texts and cultivate their own devotion. Intended for parents to read in the circle of their children and servants, these works helped prepare the household for Sunday worship and review the pastor's sermon. The pioneering effort of Veit Dietrich, pastor in Nuremberg, formerly Luther's amanuensis, *Sermons for Children*, provided sermons on the gospel lessons appointed for each Sunday and festival of the church year in three volumes.[36] A woodcut depicting an element of the pericopal reading preceded the biblical text, which preceded the sermon itself. Designed for reading in family devotions, it was also useable by a village pastor as a Sunday sermon. Theologians continued to compose such works into the 17th century. Related were postils in poetic form by the lay poet and dramatist Andreas Gryphius, who wrote under the influence of the pastor-hymnist Johann Heermann.[37]

The postil form gave birth to related genre. Special collections of sermons on the passion and death of Christ afforded readers special devotional exercises. Luther had departed from medieval models of meditating on Christ's passion, which emphasized his suffering *with* sinners; Luther focused on his atoning sacrifice *for* them. His own students continued to devote special efforts to sermons for passion week observances, sometimes with the completion of the week on Easter, sometimes not. Many authors followed Melanchthon's model for casting the week between Palm Sunday and crucifixion or resurrection in the form of a drama, a play usually in five acts, to help cultivate their readers' and hearers' sense of what Christ's suffering and death should

---

[34] Jānis Krēsliņš, *Dominus narrabit in scriptura populorum: A Study of Early 17th-Century Lutheran Teaching on Preaching and the Lettische lang-gewünschte Postill of Georgius Mancelius* (Wiesbaden, 1992), pp. 123, 123–69.

[35] Ibid., pp. 171–212.

[36] *Kinderpredig/vom Aduent biß auff Pfingsten* [volume 2: *von Pfingsten biß auffs Aduent*, volume 3: *von fu[e]rnembste Festen durch das gantze Jar*] (Nuremberg, 1546).

[37] Krummacher, *Gryphius*, pp. 165–308.

mean to them. Application of Christ's atoning work as comfort and strength for trust in him guided and shaped these sermons.[38]

Other festivals also commanded special attention; Georg Major, Luther's and Melanchthon's student and colleague as professor in Wittenberg, published his sermons on Christmas, Christ's circumcision, Easter, Ascension, and Pentecost, both individually and then as a collection.[39] Some postils for Sunday gospel or epistle lessons also supplied pastors with texts for other festival observances; some authors published separate treatments of lessons for especially the lesser festivals, above all, saints days. Marian holy days which were still celebrated, like the days of apostles and evangelists and a few other biblical figures, such as John the Baptist, the martyr Stephen, and Mary Magdalene, celebrated God's grace toward the saints and expounded their lives as exemplary for obedience to God within the walks of life to which he calls his people.[40] The sermon series preached and published on Luther's life and thought related to such celebrations of God's grace and the performance of the Christian callings, but they functioned in somewhat different ways, to reinforce general Lutheran identity as well as depict how God guides his people and his church.[41] Related to these

---

[38] Robert Kolb, "Passionsmeditation. Luthers und Melanchthons Schüler predigen und beten die Passion," *Humanismus und Wittenberger Reformation. Festgabe des 500. Geburtstages des Praeceptor Germaniae Philipp Melanchthon am 16. Februar 1997, Helmar Junghans . . . gewidmet*, ed. Michael Beyer and Günther Wartenberg (Leipzig, 1996), pp. 267–293; and Liess, *Heermann*, pp. 192–232; Elke Axmacher, *Aus Liebe muß mein Heyland sterben. Untersuchungen zum Wandel des Passionsverständnis im frühen 18. Jahrhundert* (Neuhausen, 1984), pp. 11–88. Among many examples, Johann Mathesius, *Passionale Mathesij. Das ist/ Christliche vnnd andechtige Erklerung vnd Außlegung des Zwey vnd Zwantzigsten Psalms/ vnd Drey vnd Funfftzigsten Capitels des Propheten Esaiae . . .* (Leipzig, 1587); see also his *Fastenpredigten/ Von Christlicher vnd seliger betrachtung des leidens vnd sterbens vnsers Herrn Jesu Christi/ zur lehr vnd trost den einfeltigten gepredigt . . .* (Nuremberg, 1570).

[39] Kolb, "Major".

[40] Beth Kreitzer, *Reforming Mary. Changing Images of the Virgin Mary in Lutheran Sermons of the 16th Century* (Oxford, 2004); see also Robert Kolb, "Festivals of the Saints in the Late Reformation Lutheran Preaching," *The Historian* 53 (1990), 613–626, and Mary Jane Haemig, "John the Baptist in Reformation Preaching," in *Vanha ja nuori. Juhlakirja Simo Heinisen täyttäessä 60 vuotta* (Helsinki, 2003), pp. 147–63.

[41] The biographically-focused series of Mathesius, *Historien/ Von des Ehrwirdigen in Gott Seligen thewren Manns Gottes, Doctoris Martini Luthers/ anfang/ lehr/ leben vnd sterben . . .* (Nuremberg, 1566); and theologically-focused series of Cyriakus Spangenberg, preached twice yearly between 1562 and 1573, appeared collected in *Theander Lutherus. Von des werten Gottes Manne Doctor Martin Luthers Geistliche Haushaltung vnd Ritterschaft . . .* (Ursel, 1589). See Hans Volz, *Die Lutherpredigten des Johannes Mathesius: Kritische Untersuchung zur Geschichtsschreibung im Zeitalter der Reformation* (Halle, 1929); Wolfgang Herrmann, "Die Lutherpredigten des Cyriacus Spangenberg," *Mansfelder Blätter* 39 (1934/1935), 7–95; Robert Kolb, *Martin Luther as Prophet, Teacher, and Hero. Images of the Reformer, 1520–1620*

sermons on Luther, but conceived with a somewhat different purpose, were the anniversary sermons of the introduction of the Reformation in territorial churches. This type sermon became particularly prominent in the early years of the 17th century, culminating in the Reformation festivals of 1617.[42]

Catechetical services for the young—and for the reinforcement of the core of belief and practice of their elders—marked the regular rhythm of the church's week in some territories and municipalities. In others such sermons found their place at certain times of the year, such as Advent. Pastors preached on the chief parts of the catechism (Ten Commandments, Apostles' Creed, Lord's Prayer, Baptism, Lord's Supper, and, sometimes, Confession or Office of the Keys). The sermons explained catechetical content but were never simply aimed at transmitting information. Rather, their aim was that of Lutheran preaching more generally—to preach the gospel.[43] Some preachers singled out the text of the Apostles Creed for treatment in special series, a good catechetical overview of the faith.[44] Some postil writers also reveal that they regularly tied in the Sunday morning pericopal texts with the parts of the catechism, to give a basis from it for understanding and applying the text, and at the same time to review how the catechism functions as a guidebook for daily life.[45] The sermons delivered in these services reinforced the fundamentals found in Luther's Small Catechism.

(Grand Rapids, 1999), pp. 46–55, 86–91; Susan Boettcher, "Martin Luthers Leben in Predigten: Johannes Mathesius & Cyriakus Spangenberg," in *Martin Luther und der Bergbau im Mansfelder Land*, ed. Rosemarie Knape (Eisleben, 2000), pp. 163–87.

[42] See Hans-Jürgen Schönstädt, *Antichrist, Weltheilsgeschehen und Gottes Werkzeug. Römische Kirche, Reformation, und Luther im Spiegel des Reformationsjubiläums 1617* (Wiesbaden, 1978), 86–303.

[43] Mary Jane Haemig, "The Living Voice of the Catechism: German Lutheran Catechetical Preaching 1530–1580" (Th.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1996).

[44] Georg von Anhalt, *Kurtze Vnnd tro[e]stliche Betrachtunge vnsers heiligen Christlichen Glaubens/vnd der furnemesten Artickeln/in sonderheit/von vergebung der su[e]nden/Aufferstehung des Fleisches/vnd ewigem Leben/Amen* (Leipzig, 1550); Hieronymus Weller, *Ein kurtze vnd tro[e]stliche außlegung des allgemeinen/Christlichen bekentniß oder glaubens/so man nennet Symbolum Apostolicum* (Nuremberg, 1564); Georg Major, *Auslegung des Glaubens/welcher das Symbolum Apostolicum genandt wird. Den einfeltigen Pfarherrn vnd allen Hausvetern zu dienste in zwentzig Predigt vefasset* (Wittenberg, 1550), Christoph Irenaeus, *Symbolvm Apostolicvm. Das ist. Die Artickel vnsers Christlichen Glaubens/ausgelegt…* (Eisleben, 1562) and *Des dritten Artickels vnsers Christlichen Glaubens folgende stu[e]ck. Ich gleub Ein heilige Christliche Kirche Die gemeine der Heiligen Vergebung der Su[e]nden…* (Eisleben, 1563).

[45] Mathesius does this in his *Postilla*, as does Simon Musaeus, *Postilla. Das ist/Außlegung der Euangelien…* (Frankfurt/Main, 1567). See n. 79–80 below.

Also related to the postil collections of sermons for regular Sunday worship were collections of wedding sermons and funeral sermons. Eberhard Winkler's seminal study[46] concluded that the funeral sermon flowered in the 17th century; it therefore can tell us much about sermons and piety in that period (some 220,000 German Lutheran funeral homilies are extant). Rather than focusing on the deeds or the manner of death of the deceased, Luther focused on Christ and the triumph he won for believers over death. Luther's own preaching for the funerals of Electors Friedrich (1525) and Johann (1532) quickly came into print as part of the Saxon observation of their deaths; within two decades publishing funeral sermons, sometimes (but not always) with biographical data, became a staple part of Lutheran piety surrounding death. The printing of these sermons both honored the deceased and cultivated pious consideration of both life and death.[47]

During the 17th century, the funeral sermon was almost exclusively thematic. Like other sermons in this time, it was characterized by careful organization into parts and subparts, careful distinctions, and the use of Aristotelian thinking to clarify its content. Its content treated all parts of life from the standpoint of eternity. But throughout the reformatory teaching of justification by faith remained central. Only this made consolation and certainty of salvation possible. The hope of resurrection and promise of eternal life are emphasized more strongly than the final judgment. Descriptions of hell are seldom found, but some preachers attempted to depict resurrection and eternal life. In form and content funeral sermons did not differ from other sermons. Originally, Lutheran funeral sermons in the 16th century proclaimed the biblical text; if biographical notes were present, they were secondary. However, during the 17th century, though sermons continued to be biblically based (both canonical and apocryphal books were used),

---

[46] Eberhard Winkler, *Die Leichenpredigt im deutschen Luthertum bis Spener* (Munich, 1967).

[47] Cornelia Niekus Moore, *Patterned Lives. The Lutheran Funeral Biography in Early Modern Germany* (Wiesbaden, 2006). See also pioneering work done on the genre by Rudolf Lenz: *Leichenpredigten als Quelle historischer Wissenschaften*, 4 vols. (Cologne/Vienna, 1975; Marburg, 1975, 1983; Stuttgart, 2004); *Studien zur deutschsprachigen Leichenpredigt der frühen Neuzeit* (Marburg, 1981); *De mortuis nil nisi bene?* (Sigmaringen, 1990). Much of this research treats historical/biographical/literary aspects of the genre. A good though brief focus on their theological content and context is found in Irene Dingel, "'Recht glauben, christlich leben und seliglich sterben'. Leichenpredigt als evangelische Verkündigung im 16. Jahrhundert," in *Leichenpredigten als Quelle*, 4:9–36, and Liess, *Heermann*, pp. 235–72.

biographical comments became more extensive. Some preachers dared to criticize the departed, but for the most part funeral sermons related nothing but good.[48] Funeral sermons grew in length from fifteen to thirty minutes in the 16th century to some two or three hours long in the 17th.[49]

17th-century critics both lay and clergy found the praise of the individual playing too large a role in such sermons and preachers tending toward self-display at funerals; by the end of the century the "silent" (sermonless) funeral gained ground in some quarters; apart from this development the publication of funeral sermons began to taper off by the end of the century.[50]

Because accompanying the grieving to the grave ranked high among the pastoral duties of the local preacher, it is no wonder that models to aid preparation of funeral sermons became available early. Johann Spangenberg, who had published his own postils, also gathered model funeral sermons; his son Cyriakus subsequently expanded the series.[51] Many followed this model and provided pastors with sermons to shape their own preaching for their members. Similarly Cyriakus Spangenberg, Johannes Mathesius, and others gathered wedding sermons to offer similar help to parish preachers.[52] Individual wedding sermons were not generally published. One result is the existence of far less scholarly investigation of these works. These collections served perhaps less as

---

[48] Niekus Moore, *Patterned Lives*, pp. 133–275.

[49] Winkler, *Leichenpredigt*, pp. 237–39.

[50] Ibid., pp. 277–82.

[51] Irene Dingel, "'Recht glauben,'" pp. 12–17. Cf. Johann Mathesius, *Leychpredigten auss den fünffzehenden Capitel der I. Epistel S. Pauli zun Corinthiern. Von der aufferstehung der Todten vnd ewigem leben* (Nuremberg, 1559) and Nikolaus Selnecker, *Christliche Leychpredigten*… (Magdeburg, 1591) (on Selnecker's work, see ibid., Dingel, "'Recht glauben,'" pp. 17–20), among others.

[52] Spangenberg, *Ehespiegel/Das ist/Alles was von dem heyligen Ehestande/nutzliches/no[e]tiges/vnnd ttro[e]stliches mag gesagt werden/Jn LXX. Brautpredigten/zusammen verfasset* (Strasbourg, 1578); Johann Heinrich Weihenmaier, *Die Eheliche Liebes-Pflicht/und Ehrliche Nahrung/In Zwey und Dreißig Hochzeit-Predigten*… (Ulm, 1682); Mathesius, *Ehespiegel Mathesij. Das ist: Christliche vnd Tro[e]stliche Erklerung etlicher vornehmer Spru[e]che altes vnd Newes Testaments vom heiligen Ehestande*… (Leipzig, 1591). In *Singing the Gospel*, pp. 224–225, n. 75, Christopher B. Brown notes his disagreement with the negative assessment of Mathesius' wedding sermons in regard to their view of women, the conclusion of Susan Karant-Nunn, "*Kinder, Küche, Kirche*: Social Ideology in the Sermons of Johannes Mathesius," in *Germania Illustrata. Essays on Early Modern Grmany Presented to Gerald Strauss*, ed. Andrew C. Fix and Susan C. Karant-Nunn (Kirksville, MO, 1992), pp. 121–140. Brown is preparing a study of Mathesius' wedding sermons.

models for preaching than as pastoral care manuals for a broader range of family problems.

Entire books of the Bible served as the basis for series of sermons conducted apart from Sunday morning worship. Some published these series as homiletical commentaries. Miriam Chrisman has labeled the seven commentaries on Pauline epistles of Cyriakus Spangenberg "the most important biblical commentaries of this period".[53] Even if hard to prove, this claim shows how important not only Spangenberg's own work but also the homiletical style of biblical comment was for parish pastors, who above all needed biblical exegesis to support their preaching. Such homiletical commentaries continued to be a favorite form for conveying the study of Scripture to parish pastors; authors treated books from Genesis to Revelation, with the Psalms, John's gospel, and Paul's epistles the favorites.[54] Although Lutheran preachers generally avoided the apocryphal books, Jesus Syrach won comment in such sermon series because of its usefulness in ethical instruction.[55]

Finally, printed topical sermons constitute a significant element in the public face of Lutheran thought throughout this period. Mathesius provided a kind of biographical overview of the life of Jesus in one collection of such sermons.[56] His widely-used *Sarepta* imaginatively applied suitable passages of Scripture to the lives of the miners to whom he ministered.[57] Crises of various kinds, such as natural disasters and the threat of the Turk, provided occasions for sermons calling for

---

[53] *Lay Culture, Learned Culture, Books and Social Change in Strasbourg, 1480–1599* (New Haven, 1982), p. 242. See Robert Kolb, "Learning to Drink from the Foundations of Israel, Cyriakus Spangenberg Learns Hermeneutics from Luther," "On Eternal Predestination and God's Election by Grace, The Exegetical Basis of the Lutheran Teaching in Cyriakus Spangenberg's Commentary on Romans 8 & 9," "Preaching and Hearing in Luther's Congregations, Village Pastors and Peasant Congregations," *Lutheran Synod Quarterly* 34 (1994), 2–31, 32–59, 60–91; rpt. idem, *Luther's Heirs Define His Legacy* (Aldershot, 1996), #XIII.

[54] E.g., Musaeus, *Richtige vnd Reine Auslegung des Ersten Buchs Mosy…* (Magdeburg, 1576); Selnecker, *Der herrliche Prophet Esaias/in diesen schweren vnd ku[e]mmerlichen zeiten… Christlich/ku[e]rtzlich/vnd einfeltig fu[e]r den gemeinen Man/erkleret…* (Leipzig, 1569), Selnecker, *Der gantze Psalter Dauids ausgelegt* (Leipzig, 1571), Matthias Höe von Höenig, *Commentariorum In Beati Apostoli Et Evangelistæ Johannis Apocalypsin* (Leipzig, 1610–1640).

[55] E.g., Johann Mathesius, *Syrach Mathesij Das ist/Christliche/Lehrhaffte/Trostreiche vnd lustige Erklerung vnd Außlegung des scho[e]nen Haußbuchs/so der weyse Mann Syrach… geschrieben…* (Leipzig, 1586).

[56] *Historia Vnsers lieben Herren vnd Heylands Jesu Christi…* (Nuremberg, 1568).

[57] *Sarepta Oder Bergpostill Sampt der Joachimßthalischen kurtzen Chroniken* (Nuremberg, 1562).

repentance.[58] In the case of some topical sermons the specific circumstances of their origin and use limited their larger impact. That was not so true of those that treated doctrinal and ethical topics as those that celebrated special events, such as festivals of the Reformation.

These special adaptations in the nature and purpose of published sermons must be viewed within the context of the normal rhythm of preaching that people encountered whenever they attended public worship. Those sermons repeated the fundamental elements of the Wittenberg view of reality, in better or worse form, from Sunday to Sunday, drilling Luther's catechetical faith, as applied to the ever-changing circumstances of parish life through the mind of the pastor, into the people's way of thinking. Intelligent enough, whether literate or not, they processed the tradition that their shepherd passed on to them. Because the hearers left so few records of how that process took place, studies of thought in the 16th century will remain somewhat "elitist". To a large extent, the alternative is not to study the mind of the common people but rather the thinking of the "strange" people, those whose exceptions to the message found their way into public records through heresy trials, arrests for bad behavior, or other "aberrant" activities. They are indeed interesting but most often had relatively little influence on the way people of their own time lived or on the future. Therefore, they fascinate, but their impact is easily overinterpreted. Therefore, with all their limitations granted, sermons—even printed sermons—remain a key source for studying the mentality of early modern Europeans.

Efforts to teach and improve preaching

Given the centrality of public proclamation for the Lutheran Reformation, it is not surprising that great efforts were made to teach and improve preaching. These efforts included general efforts to raise the educational qualifications of clergy as well as more specific efforts aimed at strengthening homiletical and pastoral practice.

---

[58] Cf., e.g., Susan Boettcher, "Confessional Preaching in Times of Crisis: Jacob Andreae's 'Thirteen Sermons on the Turk,' (1568)," *Comparative Studies in South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 24 (2004), 101–15.

Education of Pastors

Educational levels of Lutheran pastors differed widely in the 16th century,[59] as do current interpretations of the data on their education at hand. Though it appears that few specific requirements for theological education existed in Lutheran churches around 1550, in most cases authorities encouraged—if not theoretically "required"—some university study. Jonathan Strom notes that by the mid-17th century "in most cases a candidate for a rural parish in Mecklenburg was required to have one to two years of study at an orthodox university and a recommendation from the faculty. A candidate for an urban parish was expected to have completed at least two to three years of study." Larger towns tended to have more highly educated pastors—or at least pastors who had studied longer.[60] At the end of the 16th century, notes Luise Schorn Schütte, a significant number of both Lutheran and Roman Catholic clergy had not completed a university education, though she also notes that in Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel

> of the seventy-six clergy who entered the service of the principality between 1585 and 1630, 80 percent had studied at the principality's university. Within two generations the goal of a university education, at least in the arts, had been formally attained for the future clergy of this Protestant territory. This does not mean, however, that all beginning pastors had a more thorough education than did the first generation of Lutheran clergy. Despite the stipulations of the church ordinance of 1569, evidence of having completed a university education, even within the arts faculty, was not necessary for appointment to a parish position.[61]

Lutherans attempted to improve the clergy's theological knowledge and preaching skills through a variety of tactics. Both cities and territories established secondary schools (*Gymnasium*) and universities to raise the level of education. Some areas provided scholarships to poor but gifted students. These measures had an impact. By the mid-17th century clear

---

[59] Luise Schorn-Schütte, "Priest, Preacher, Pastor: Research on Clerical Office in Early Modern Europe," *Central European History* 33 (2000), 1–39.

[60] Strom, *Orthodoxy*, p. 44.

[61] Schorn-Schütte, "Priest," pp. 15, 19–20. Rainer Postel finds a similar pattern in Hamburg, "Hamburger Theologenausbildung vor und nach der Reformation" in *Bildung und Konfession: Theologenausbildung im Zeitalter der Konfessionalisierung*, eds. Herman J. Selderhuis and Markus Wriedt (Tübingen, 2006), pp. 51–60. Strom, *Orthodoxy*, p. 44, notes a difference between the education levels of pastors in Rostock and those in rural Mecklenburg. See also Sven Tode, "Bildung und Wissenskultur der Geistlichkeit im Danzig der Frühen Neuzeit" in *Bildung und Konfess*ion, pp. 61–101.

rules for appointment to a parish were being enforced: at last "the church ordinances of the late 16th century had a normative effect".[62]

Exploration of formal higher-level training in homiletical skills at Lutheran universities in the period has only begun and should command further research.

Preaching theories and manuals; pastoral manuals

Both pastors with formal theological education and those without had at hand a variety of treatises relevant to preaching, and a number of pastoral manuals that included advice on how to preach. Though Luther is the paradigm of Lutheran preaching, he never produced a manual on how to preach. Preaching advice is scattered through his works; he influenced preaching chiefly by example. He clearly knew and followed classical rhetorical principles,[63] but his colleague Philip Melanchthon codified the rhetorical theory of the blossoming humanist movement of their time into rhetorical guidelines that are key to understanding 16th- and 17th-century Lutheran preaching.

Melanchthon's two most influential works on preaching were *De officiis concionatoris* (1529) and *Elementa rhetorices* (1532).[64] He started from classical rhetoric with its three rhetorical genera: *genus iudicalis* (judicial), *genus deliberativum* (deliberative), and *genus demonstrativum* (epideictic or demonstrative). In classical rhetoric each of these had a particular setting. A speech of the judicial genus was designed to convince in the courtroom, those of the deliberative genus in the political arena. The demonstrative speech was not intended to convince but rather to move the listener emotionally. Melanchthon, like most 16th-century theorists, "minimized or eliminated the use of the *genus iudiciale* in the pulpit".[65] Melanchthon added a fourth, the *genus didascalicum*, or teaching genus. In his *De officiis concionatoris* (1529) Melanchthon detailed three genera: 1) the *didascalicum* to teach true doctrine, 2) the *epitrepticum* to exhort to faith, and 3) the *paraeneticum* to exhort to good morals. The latter two are adaptations of the deliberative genus. Melanchthon generally

[62] Schorn-Schütte, "Preaching," p. 20.

[63] Ulrich Nembach, *Predigt des Evangeliums: Luther als Prediger, Pädagoge und Rhetor* (Neukirchen, 1972).

[64] Uwe Schnell, *Die homiletische Theorie Philipp Melanchthons* (Berlin/Hamburg, 1968), 63–100.

[65] O'Malley, "Content," p. 242.

rejected the demonstrative except as it related to the *didascalium.* The most important are the *didascalicum* and *epitrepticum* "because they deal with faith while the *paraeneticum* deals with action".[66] Preaching thus came to be seen as primarily teaching and exhortation, following Luther's instruction in his first postil.

Melanchthon also influenced the manner in which the content of the sermon was constructed. Melanchthon favored a topical approach, drawing relevant *loci communes* (commonplaces, topics) out of a text.[67] Although some scholars view this topical method as an effort at dogmatization, imposing a doctrinal system upon Scripture, he conceived it to perform a very different task. He designed the "*loci*" to help students of Scripture organize Bible passages from various biblical books according to the topics or questions which they might anticipate from their hearers or which the Bible as a whole made critical elements in Christian understanding of God and his will. Rather than "doctrine" (mis)shaping the "sermon," the humanist "topical" method intended to permit the needs of the hearers and the wisdom of the proclaimer of God's Word to organize the biblical raw material for most effective address to people's real-life needs.[68] Whether the practice of Lutheran dogmatics actually altered that relationship in the course of the 17th century is a question which cannot be answered fairly because so little research has been done on preaching and exegesis in that period. The influence of Melanchthon's rhetorical methods continued to play a role in shaping the preaching of Mancelius or Johann Heermann[69] and their contemporaries. For instance, they continued to use the *loci* method though they did alter its functions somewhat. "While for Melanchthon the *loci* are explicitly articles of faith, all subordinated to the two primary ones, Law and Gospel, for the early 17th-century Lutheran authors they constitute all possible topics that may be presented in the analysis of a particular pericope".[70] This trend had begun in the late 16th century among Melanchthon's students.

Indeed, Melanchthon did not stand alone in shaping 17th-century Lutheran rhetorical methods. Luther became "almost invisible as a

[66] Schnell, *Homiletische Theorie*, pp. 36–100; O'Malley, "Content," pp. 242–43.
[67] Schnell, *Homiletische Theorie*, pp. 46–51.
[68] Robert Kolb, "Teaching the Text. The Commonplace Method in Sixteenth Century Lutheran Biblical Commentary," *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 49 (1987), 571–85.
[69] Liess, *Heermann*, pp. 89–91
[70] Krēsliņš, *Dominus*, p. 16.

source of a theory of preaching" (and perhaps always was although his example had exercised great influence), and Melanchthon "is only infrequently referred to in the treatises, though some of his innovations are readily incorporated in them"—an important qualification.[71] "Perhaps the most innovative feature of early 17th-century Lutheran teaching on preaching is the transformation of the classical *genus* theory to fit the needs of the sermon". Melanchthon's reworking of the theory to add a teaching genus was not considered sufficient. 17th-century Lutheran authors looked to Desiderius Erasmus and the Bucerian Marburg professor Andreas Hyperius, along with their contemporary Reformed theologian, Bartholomaeus Keckermann, to expand the Melanchthonian framework of their homiletical theory. Hyperius developed a biblical approach to the rhetorical genera in *De formandis concionibus sacris* (1553). Rejecting the classical *genera*, Hyperius believed that Scripture (specifically 2 Timothy 3:16 and Romans 14:19) provided the forms for preaching.[72] Combining insights from Melanchthon, Erasmus, Hyperius, and Keckermann, the Melanchthonian-Lutheran sermon found form in five *genera*, according to Jānis Krēsliņš: the didactic (presenting biblical teaching within a law/gospel framework in the context of the turbulent times, calling believers to repentance and faithful service within their callings as Judgment Day grew imminent), the refutatory (countering remnants of medieval piety and counter-reformatory activities), the institutive (forming Christian attitudes that led to personal reform and service to neighbors), the corrective (putting sinful desires to death), and the consolatory (comforting believers in the face of earthly suffering and assuring them of God's never-ending love).[73] Each genus corresponded to a type of sermon, though sermons might not fit neatly into one category only.

Alongside these recent rhetorical theorists, Aristotle assumed a larger place than previously in shaping the rhetoric of the 17th-century homiletical textbooks. Wittenberg professor Aegidius Hunnius' treatise, *The Method of Preaching* [*Methodus Concionandi*] (1595) exemplifies those influenced by aristotelian metaphysics. The interest in Aristotelian causes affected the form of Lutheran sermons. "The interest in form is most evident in the discussion on the *dispositio*, the composition of the

[71] Ibid., p. 16.
[72] Ibid., pp. 16–17, 57–58.
[73] Ibid., pp. 16–17, 171–197.

sermon. Here the Lutheran theologians derive a concentric model of the sermon which has as its center a threefold *confirmatio* or presentation of argument".[74]

In late 16th- and 17th-century Lutheran universities these theories of delivery were not delivered to students in formal courses in homiletics or other disciplines labeled "practical" for the past two centuries. All lectures and other learning activities were regarded as preparation for teaching and preaching God's Word in the parish. The core of the curriculum remained biblical studies; the commentaries published from the lectures of professors demonstrate that they aimed to cultivate practice in preaching and pastoral care. So did treatises and other formulations on the nature of theological education in this period. Jacob Andreae, among others, emphasized that theological education above all must develop the competence of future pastors to place their knowledge in the proper hermeneutical framework and to convey it to their people.[75]

Other rhetorical handbooks in the latter half of the 16th and 17th centuries followed these emphases. Jānis Krēsliņš has offered the best overview and analysis of this literature.[76] He identifies the centers of work on Lutheran homiletical theory as the universities at Wittenberg, Rostock, and Jena. Those who wrote on preaching at these universities regarded themselves as heirs of the 16th-century tradition of preaching rhetoric and strove to incorporate new insights into their theories of preaching.[77]

In Rostock David Chytraeus published a rhetorical handbook (1556) that followed Melanchthon's principles. Although this textbook contains no specific instructions for preaching, Chytraeus's rhetorical and didactic instruction prepared students aiming to become pastors for the task of preaching. He advised clear structure and order, the use of illustrations, and application to life. His colleague Simon Pauli also authored a textbook which applied Melanchthon's rhetoric, particularly oriented around his *loci*-method, to proclamation of God's Word (1565). Another colleague, Lucas Bacmeister the Elder, also published instruction in homiletics following the Melanchthonian model (1570). A

---

[74] Ibid., pp. 17–18.

[75] Marcel Nieden, *Die Erfindung des Theologen. Wittenberger Anweisungen zum Theologiestudium im Zeitalter von Reformation und Konfessionalisierung* (Tübingen, 2006), p. 107; cf. pp. 170, 189–194, 214–15, 235, 242–43.

[76] Krēsliņš, *Dominus*, pp. 21–75.

[77] Ibid., pp. 13–19.

century later, the *Orator Ecclesiasticus* (1659) of their successor Heinrich Müller continued that tradition while reflecting newer discussions of rhetorical theory.[78]

The Silesian pastor Martin Moller counted among his highly-influential edificatory publications a postil, entitled *The Practice of [Preaching] the Gospel Lessons* [*Praxis Evangeliorum*], issued in 1601. It illustrated and modeled his "practice," which included the proper cultivation and use of rhetorical principles for the application of the gospel lessons to people's lives in proper homiletical fashion, so that the teaching of Scripture might come alive in their daily faith and conduct. Good preaching aimed to foster and nurture both the trust of the people in their Savior and their care of one another. Moller's sermons offered readers a "meditative catechesis" that put the framework of Luther's catechisms to work in building faith and new obedience.[79]

Half a century later the Tübingen professor Tobias Wagner published the first of seven volumes of his *Textual Postil* on the gospels (1652) (two such volumes appeared in 1668 on the epistles). An uncompromising polemicist in controversy, as a preacher Wagner put the rhetorical tradition of Lutheranism to work to bring comfort and admonition to his people. He followed the Melanchthonian rules as they had been developed over the previous century, employing his *loci communes* gathered from Scripture, the ancient fathers, Bernhard of Clairvaux and other medieval theologians, and, prominently, Luther, to teach and remind hearers of the basic biblical teaching, to refute false teaching, to admonish them to faithful Christian living, and to comfort them in the face of temptation and suffering. He also used Luther's catechisms as a pedagogical guide for his hearers in every sermon. His goal was to put God's Word to use, by calling the people to repentance and turning them to Christ alone, so that they might be built up in trust and in the practice of God's commands.[80] Moller's and Wagner's postils demonstrate how the homiletical tradition took concrete form and substance in the 17th century. Despite increased concentration of rhetorical method and fresh recognition of its importance, a host

---

[78] Kaufmann, *Universität*, pp. 471–507.

[79] Elke Axmacher, *Praxis Evangeliorum. Theologie und Frömmigkeit bei Martin Moller (1547–1606)* (Göttingen, 1989), pp. 232–270; *Praxis Evangeliorum*… (Görlitz, 1601).

[80] Beutel, "Lehr und Leben in der Predigt der lutherischen Orthodoxie, Dargestellt am Beispiel des Tübinger Kontroverstheologen und Universitätskanzlers Tobias Wagner (1598–1680)," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 93 (1996), 429–444.

of specific questions about the use of various rhetorical methods and devices invite further study, profitable for gaining access to the ways in which communication took place in early-modern Europe.[81]

Manuals for the Conduct of the Pastoral Office

Rhetorical and preaching handbooks were not the only instruments shaping preaching. Pastoral manuals with a broader range of topics also sought to help pastors shape the form and content of their sermons. These were more broadly oriented than treatises on rhetoric or preaching. Most reflected the rhetorical and preaching theories of Melanchthon and others mentioned above, but some cast their message in a different way, not presuming a university education for all readers. These manuals initially were designed above all for those who had no formal study of theology or, particularly in the 16th century, were former Roman Catholic priests who needed to be re-educated in the task of preaching a Lutheran sermon. By the end of the 16th century, these audiences were largely disappearing. Tübingen professor Felix Bidembach composed his manual in 1603 for his students, who had been thoroughly trained in the theology and methods of exegesis and had much practice in preaching but were inexperienced with regard to other aspects of pastoral care. For all pastors, whether theologically educated or not, manuals on pastoral practice offered guidance on various pastoral tasks and often "gave some advice on how to preach".[82]

Late medieval writers had fashioned the genre of the manual for pastoral care,[83] but the emphasis on preaching and different definitions of pastoral care modified this genre in the Reformation. One of the first of such manuals, by Johannes Rivius (1546), was aimed at pastors of rural churches. Rivius regarded preaching and teaching as the pastor's most important tasks. The pastor must teach the basics of the

---

[81] One example is Susan Boettcher's "Preliminary Considerations on the Rhetorical Construction of Jews in Lutheran Preaching at Mid-16th Century," in *Bundeseinheit und Gottesvolk. Reformierter Protestantismus und Judentum im Europa des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts*, ed. Achim Detmers (Wuppertal, 2005), pp. 105–36.

[82] Amy Nelson Burnett, "The Evolution of the Lutheran Pastors' Manual in the 16th Century," *CH* 73 (2004), 538.

[83] Peter A. Dykema, "Handbooks for Pastors: Late Medieval Manuals for Parish Priests and Conrad Porta's *Pastorale Lutheri* (1582)," in *Continuity and Change: Studies in Honor of Heiko Augustinus Oberman*, ed. Andrew C. Gow and Robert J. Bast (Leiden, 2000), pp. 143–51.

Christian faith; in doing so he had to be aware of his parishioners' abilities and explain things simply and repeatedly. Rivius emphasized that "in preaching, the pastor was to accommodate his language to his audience, to speak cautiously and soberly, and to avoid statements that could cause offense or be misunderstood".[84] Copenhagen professor Niels Hemmingsen's pastoral manual (1565) detailed the procedures for writing a sermon. In a section on homiletics in an earlier work, he had used the principles of classical rhetoric as well as Melanchthon's rhetoric.

> In his pastoral manual Hemmingsen simplified even further the procedures for writing a sermon: the pastor should define his topic, distribute it into appropriate parts, and then discuss each part in order with appropriate scriptural support. The sermon was to conclude with a brief summary, repeating the chief points and showing the hearers how they could be applied. In all his teaching the pastor was to use clear language and match his topic to his audience.[85]

Hemmingsen's manual addressed more than the structural aspects of sermons: a pastor was not only to teach but also to "move hearts," to help people apply what they have heard in their daily life. For this to happen, the pastor "must match his message to the psychological state of the hearer".[86]

Mansfeld superintendent Erasmus Sarcerius produced a handbook with more practical tips on the wide variety of pastoral tasks, gleaned from his own work on marriage, the publications of others, and his own years of experience in pastorates in Nassau and Saxony. His *Pastorale* (1559) began by offering a method for study of Scripture centered on organizing its message by topics. This method could also guide his delivery of the Word. Sarcerius was critical of pastors who did not take time to think through and write out their sermons before delivering them. He was also sensitive to the needs of the audience. Lengthy sermons not only took too long to write; they were inefficient for teaching because the audience could not remember their contents. Citing

---

[84] Burnett, "Evolution," p. 544.

[85] Burnett, "Evolution," pp. 547–48. Kenneth Hagen, "*De Exegetica Methodo*. Niels Hemmingsen's *De Methodis* 1555," in *The Bible in the 16th Century*, ed. David Steinmetz, (Durham, 1990), pp. 181–96.

[86] Burnett, "Evolution," p. 548.

Luther, he reminded his reader that "preaching isn't a skill; knowing when to stop is a skill".[87]

A quarter century later Mansfeld pastor Conrad Porta compiled a pastoral manual (1582) largely out of citations from Luther's writings. It opens with a discussion of "the worthiness and exaltedness of the preaching office". Porta was less specific than the others on how to prepare sermons but stressed that the preacher should preach at a level of understanding appropriate to his listeners. It was better to preach on the basics of the faith as expressed in the catechism than on difficult biblical books such as Daniel and Revelation. Porta expected the preachers to reject false teaching and condemn contemporary heretics. "Porta was here clearly more attuned to doctrinal controversy than were his predecessors, and he was much more forceful in urging the need for polemics against the enemies of orthodoxy".[88] Porta also recognized the sermon as a source of consolation.

Bidembach's manual marks a new stage in the pastoral manual's homiletical instruction. He presumed the pastor-reader knew how to study Scripture but needed tips for preaching each pericopal text to a congregation. These Bidembach offered, providing a theme for each lesson in a single sentence and outline points to develop the theme. Accompanying these points are topical suggestions. Bidembach also provided texts for funeral and wedding sermons. The former list offered specific texts for those who were old or young, for women who died in childbirth or those who had suffered long illnesses, Amy Nelson Burnett observes, "Underlying all of these sections is the assumption that a young pastor was quite capable of writing a sermon by himself, but that given the many demands on his time, he needed a quick way to identify a sermon topic".[89]

Burnett notes that these manuals for pastoral practice focused the preaching task sometimes on catechetization and knowledge of doctrine, sometimes on consolation and personal application of doctrine to daily life. Hemmingsen's manual belonged to the latter category, and this trend became more pronounced, not less, in later works, she

[87] Ibid., p. 551.

[88] Ibid., p. 555; Dykema, "Handbooks," pp. 151–62; Robert Kolb, "Luther the Master Pastor: Conrad Porta's Pastorale Lutheri, Handbook for Generations," *Concordia Journal* 9 (1983), 179–87.

[89] Burnett, "Evolution," p. 557.

points out.[90] This development reflects the need for indigenization of the fundamentals of the evangelical faith in the mid-16th century and the more settled, knowledgeable level of piety some years later, when the catechetical task had laid down a more thorough basis for moving toward application.

Helps for Preaching and Biblical Studies

Luther's emphasis on biblical courses in the university curriculum and preaching in the parish prompted the composition of a wide variety of aids to biblical study which pastors could employ in preparing sermons. The great hermeneutical works of the period provided future pastors and those engaged in preaching an orientation for putting Scripture to use.[91] Summaries of the biblical books appeared as early as 1557,[92] chronologies of biblical history a bit later.[93] Other tools valuable for drafting sermons included genealogies,[94] collections of examples of biblical virtues and vices,[95] works that offered explanations of seemingly contradictory passages in the Bible,[96] linguistic helps,[97] and tools for rhetorical analysis of biblical texts.[98]

---

[90] Ibid., pp. 560–61.

[91] The most important of which—Matthias Flacius, *Clavis Scripturae sacrae* (Basel, 1567), Wolfgang Franz, *Tractatus theologicus novus et perspicuus de interpretatione sacrarum scripturarum* (Wittenberg, 1619), and Solomon Glassius, *Philologia sacra* (Jena, 1623) as well as the hermeneutical section of Johann Gerhard's *Loci theologicorum cum adstruenda veritate*… (Jena, 1610), in locus II—are discussed in Bengt Hägglund, "Pre-Kantian Hermeneutics in Lutheran Orthodoxy," *LQ* 20 (2006), 318–36.

[92] Peter Palladius, bishop of Roskilde, Denmark, *Isagoge ad libros propheticos et apostolicos*… (Wittenberg, 1557); Peter Geduldig, pastor in Landau, superintendent in Heidelberg, *Summaria vber alle vnd jede Capitel der gantzen Schrifft/deß alten vnd newen Testaments*… (Frankfurt/Main, 1587, 2. ed. 1591).

[93] Abraham Buchholtzer, *Isagoge chronologica, id est: opvscvlvm, ad annorvm seriem sacris Biblijs contexendam*… (Frankfurt/O, 1577).

[94] E.g., the charts, tables, and indices offered by the superintendent of the church in Zweibrücken, Cunmann Flinsbach, *Genealogiae Christi et omnivm popvlorvm tabvlae*… (Basel, 1567).

[95] E.g., the work of Christoph Obenhin, pastor in Ursel, *En Damus Lector, Promptvarivm sacrosanctvm, tam virtutum quàm vitiorum exempla continens*… (Ursel, 1576).

[96] Including those of the colleague and associate of Johannes Brenz in Schwäbisch Hall, Andreas Althamer, *Conciliatio locorvm scripturae, qui specie ténus inter se pugnare uidentur*… (Nuremberg, 1530), and Christoph Obenhin, *Novi testamenti locorvm pvgnantivm, ecclesiastica exposition*… (Basel, 1563).

[97] Cf. that of Abdias Praetorius, professor of Hebrew in Frankfurt an der Oder, *De phrasibus Ebraeis Commentarolvs* (Wittenberg, 1563).

[98] E.g., Johann Lonicer, professor in Marburg, *Figurarum, pro missionvm, historiarvm, caeremoniarum, Victimarum, & Sacrificiorum: Ex Testamento ueteri*… (Frankfurt/M, 1560),

The geography of the Bible elicited works of various kinds such as the *Itinerarium Scripturae* of the parish pastor of Grünau near Braunschweig Heinrich Bünting, which was printed in at least nineteen German editions and one Latin between 1581 and 1600.[99] For those who wanted to identify the people and places of Scripture Johannes Heyden assembled a sort of Bible dictionary that could be of service in every literate household.[100] German concordances to the Bible appeared in the second half of the 16th century to aid individual lay readers as well as clergy. In 1571 Peter Geduldig of Landau edited five volumes which helped readers in finding words in Luther's translation of Scripture.[101] Little if any work has explored this side of the pastor's intellectual world. More analysis is available on the collections of examples and stories which could fill sermons with both historical and contemporary illustrations of doctrinal and moral points the preachers sought to make.[102]

Quality Control of the Delivery of the Message: Efforts to Improve Preaching

Because of the importance of the task of preaching, church leaders put in place measures to help local pastors understand the expectations related to preaching which these officials had. Their standards were set in the constitutions of the territorial churches (*Kirchenordnung*), which often provided both criteria and means for assessing preaching. Attempts to cultivate these standards took place during the visitation of parishes conducted by consistories or other organs for governing the church.

---

and the works of Leipzig professor Joachim Camerarius, *Notatio figvrarvm sermonis* (Leipzig, 1572) and *Notatio figvrarvm orationis et mvtatae simplicis elocvtionis in apostolicis scripti*… (Leipzig, 1572).

[99] *Itinerarivm sacrae scriptvrae Das ist/Ein Reisebuch, Vber die gantze heilige Schrift* (Helmstedt, 1581).

[100] *Biblisch Namen Buch*… (Frankfurt/Main, 1565). David Chytraeus edited a similar work for pastors: *Onomasticon theologicvm*… (Wittenberg, 1557).

[101] *Concordantz vnd Zeiger Vber die gantze heilige Biblische schrifft*… (5 volumes, Frankfurt/Main, 1571).

[102] See the essays in *Volkserzählung und Reformation*, ed. Wolfgang Brückner (Berlin, 1974): Brückner, "Historien und Historie. Erzählliteratur des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts als Forschungsaufgabe," pp. 13–124; Bernward Deneke, "Kaspar Goltwurm. Ein lutherischer Kompilator zwischen Überlieferung und Glaube," pp. 125–78; Ernst Heinrich Rehermann, "Die protestantischen Exempelsammlungen des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts," 580–646; Heidemarie Schade, "Andreas Hondorff's Promptuarium Exemplorum," pp. 647–703.

Many church orders prescribed the pattern for preaching, that is, when and where it should occur as well as what biblical texts should be used. An edict stating regulations for the visitation of parishes for electoral Brandenburg (1573) mandated that Sunday and festival preaching treat the appointed pericopal gospel and epistle texts. It also provided that, in addition to other sermons, pastors should preach the catechism once a week in cities and villages. Pastors were to give special attention to those in need and should preach often in hospitals and asylums.[103]

Some church orders provided instructions on constructing and presenting sermons. This church order for Brandenburg instructed the pastor to divide his sermon into parts "and declare and explain to the people every part in the most proper and diligent fashion, also refrain from all silly and offensive speech and swearing while in the chancel…"[104] A 1585 church order for Lauenberg instructed pastors not to use high, fancy words or words unknown to the people but rather use "common simple and well-known" language to preach in the most straightforward and clear way. It counseled pastors to pay attention to the needs of the simple laity and young children rather than to the learned. It also admonished pastors to begin services at the proper time and be able to stop so that the sermon not last over an hour. "For otherwise the listeners will grow weary (*überdrussig*) and what is said and heard after a long time is wasted effort".[105] The same church order reflected concerns for rhetorical coherence and good content, taking seriously the need for effective communication and exhorting pastors to prepare and organize their sermons carefully. They should tell people what they want to say "so that the listener knows to what he should pay attention" and at the end to review and repeat the main points. Lauenberg officials warned against "*quodlibetice*" preaching—an unorganized collection of extraneous points—"where nothing connects to anything but rather is like a beggar's coat, stitched together from many rags that do not belong together".[106]

Church orders commonly provided lists of books a preacher should own. One such list for Brandenburg prescribed German and Latin

---

[103] "Die Mark Brandenburg. Visitation- und Consistorialordnunge von 1573," *Die Evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des XVI. Jahrhunderts*, ed. Emil Sehling, 3 (Leipzig, 1909), p. 111.

[104] Ibid., p. 112.

[105] *Evangelischen Kirchenordnungen*, 5 (Leipzig, 1913) p. 415.

[106] Ibid.

Bibles, the church and house postils of Martin Luther, Luther's catechism, the church order, and, where possible, the works of Luther, Augustine, and other Christian theologians.[107] Usually such lists contained at least one postil. However, church orders also warned against simply copying the postil. They also urged pastors to study the Bible regularly.

Church orders also contained instructions for the visitation of parishes, regularly undertaken by a superintendent and/or visitation committee. Visitation instructions provided for the examination of the pastor to determine his fidelity in doctrine and teaching. Questions included sermon practice and such matters as whether "the people leave church during the sermon, before the prayer is ended".[108] Often orders asked pastors to submit written sermons or outlines. The church order for Lauenberg stated that this was for the purpose of determining the type and method of preaching used, what scripture and teaching was shown, whether the pastor directed his sermons to his listeners' edification and understanding, and whether he "simply imitates the postils or himself reads the scripture".[109] Visitation orders also provided that local officials or church elders be asked about the pastor's performance, including when and how often he preached, whether he preached clearly to the people and ended sermons promptly.[110] An additional instrument to ensure proper preaching was the meeting of a synod of pastors. Such a synod was to examine cases of pastors whose doctrine was questionable and remove those found wanting.[111]

These measures illustrate the concern of the church leadership to insure that preaching delivered God's Word effectively to the hearers in the congregation. They fit into the large spectrum of efforts to train future pastors in preaching skills at the university and to cultivate good preaching through a variety of printed means once pastors had undertaken their office in the parish. The gap between the ideal and the actual undoubtedly persisted; these Lutherans believed that human sinfulness and the frailty of human powers continually undermined the best intentions and most strenuous efforts to preach faithfully and effectively.

---

[107] *Evangelischen Kirchenordnungen*, 3:111.
[108] *Evangelischen Kirchenordnungen*, 5:428.
[109] Ibid., 5:427.
[110] Ibid., 5:430.
[111] Ibid., 5:433–434.

Preaching and Hearing in the Age of Confessionalization

"You had to be there"—preaching is one of that type of human experience. It is difficult to judge the precise impact of preaching from the distance of more than three hundred years and a significantly different culture for several reasons. These distances are among the most obvious reasons for the necessity of a certain tentativeness in scholarly judgment. The sermons that remain include unprinted manuscripts of some more or less "common and ordinary" parish pastors, but these are largely unstudied at this point. Printed sermons may be presumed to be among the "cream of the crop". They reflect what leading theologians believed should be preached and most probably what they did preach on their best days in the pulpit. Because hearers of the "common, ordinary" type leave records only seldom (how helpful blogs will be in assessing early twenty-first century mentalities remains to be seen), the impact of these sermons is difficult to assess. For, if these preachers and their sermons should be judged on the basis of their own standards, the external behavior of their parishioners is only partially helpful. It does not reveal how they trusted God, fought their sinful tendencies with more or less success, how they prayed and suffered and faced death. Nonetheless, recent studies make certain important observations.

The Preachers' Execution of the Ideals for Preaching

In recent years scholars have observed that the sources do not confirm the older charge against Lutheran preaching in the 17th century, since the time of its first pietist critics, that it was pedantic and polemical, lacking in good taste, and superficially artificial, among other charges.[112] Of course, there were better and worse preachers, and those considered better leave more of their preaching behind. To be sure, the defensive mentality of the time did exhibit itself in some critique of other confessions; Bodo Nischan observed that 17th-century preaching "became less concerned with the discovery of truth and more devoted to its defense".[113] But this is only one aspect of the entire picture. For

[112] Bernhard Liess provides an excellent summary of previous scholarship on Orthodox preaching in his book, *Heermann*, pp. 13–24.

[113] Bodo Nischan, "Demarcating Boundaries: Lutheran Pericopic Sermons in the Age of Confessionalization," in *ARG* 88 (1997), 201 (199–216), p. 201; cf. Krēsliņš, *Dominus*, pp. 75–121.

instance, in Augsburg Hans-Christoph Rublack found that preaching was not exclusively didactic nor purely argumentative. It addressed lay people with consolation and the promise of God's love.[114] Albrecht Beutel concludes that "the sermons of the confessional era were by far more edifying, concrete, and spiritual than one generally presumes on the basis of the narrow perspective of the history of formal theology and the impact of the pietistic view of history. It is noteworthy that it was not the pietistic sermon but already those in Lutheran Orthodoxy that were dominated by the two basic topics: criticism of abuses within the church and the call for repentance, conversion, and edification".[115] Bernhard Liess has shown that Johann Heermann reflected accurately the positions developed in the great dogmatic works of Johann Gerhard, but his preaching translated Gerhard's teaching into the pastorally-directed application of law and gospel to those who read his works or heard him from the pulpit.[116]

In so far as printed sermons give an indication of what was actually preached, the leading Lutheran preachers seem to have taken seriously the theorists' prescriptions for form and content. Their university education had placed at their disposal a range of material and concerns, and even though the curriculum placed homiletics at best at the edge of the enterprise of instruction, it also helped students recognize the vital place of preaching in the discipline of theology. Krēsliņš observes, "It is preaching alone which spans the entire gamut of theology. The preacher must not only be a master of the different possibilities in presenting the doctrine, but also a master of the presentation itself".[117] For presentation delivers God's Word from Scripture to the people. Always biblically based, at least in theory, often catechetically structured, these sermons were intended not to rehearse information for its own sake but to make an impact on their hearers' lives. Martin Chemnitz, for example, carefully applied law and gospel to his hearers' lives through his use of the rhetorical tools Melanchthon had placed at his disposal so that his teaching might "move their hearts" and shape their lives

[114] Hans-Christoph Rublack, "Augsburger Predigt im Zeitalter der lutherischen Orthodoxie," in *Die Augsburger Kirchenordnung von 1537 und ihr Umfeld*, ed. Reinhard Schwarz (Gütersloh, 1988), pp. 155–56.
[115] Beutel, "Lehr und Leben," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 93 (1996), 423.
[116] Summarized in Liess, *Heermann*, pp. 186–91.
[117] Krēsliņš, *Dominus*, pp. 17–18.

with his admonition and comfort.[118] Johann Heermann hewed closely to the pattern of teaching the faith through law and gospel so that he could comfort his hearers or readers and guide them into proper Christian living. He took seriously the need to call them to repentance, which he viewed as the basic rhythm of daily life for the believer. His proclamation of the gospel extended from pronouncement of forgiveness of sins into consolation in the face of all forms of suffering and temptation as well as instruction in new obedience. He also prepared them for dying with the promise of the resurrection. His preaching focused above all on the person and work of Christ and his coming to them in the Lord's Supper and spoken Word of the gospel.[119]

This consolation came always in the context of the call to repentance, however. In the 1620s–1660s Rostock's pastors frequently placed the sins of the citizens in the context of demonstrations of God's wrath in floods, pestilence, and war. This eschatological backdrop dramatized the preachers' calls for more pious conduct on Sundays and for attendance at catechetical services. They condemned abuse of alcohol, particularly on Sundays, and other activities that distracted from worship. They denounced superstitious practices and threatened God's wrath against adultery, public disorder, particularly by the youth, and other acts of disobedience.[120] Rostock's city council recognized the pastors' right to public criticism from the pulpit but instructed them to admonish the council and citizens of the town by expositing God's commandments, not by specific critiques of individuals.[121]

Such proclamation of the law was not reserved for the common people. Even the local parish pastors sometimes belied the judgment that Lutheran clergy served as the toadies of secular authorities. Some publicly criticized princes, municipal leaders, or secular managers of church property, calling them to repentance, sometimes more boldly and consistently, sometimes more hesitantly, or with ambivalence.[122] To be sure, pastors in this era probably had no more courage than people in any era when it comes to standing up to secular authorities, especially

---

[118] Bernt Torvild Oftestad, "Lehre, die das Herz Bewegt. Das Predigtparadigma bei Martin Chemnitz," *ARG* 80 (1989), 125–53.

[119] Liess, *Heermann*, pp. 95–146.

[120] Strom, *Orthodoxy*, pp. 89–92, 120–39. See also Haag, *Predigt*, pp. 47–51.

[121] Strom, *Orthodoxy*, pp. 137–39.

[122] Marcel Nieden, "Heiliger Zorn. Eine Fallstudie zur Obrigkeitskritik im frühneuzeitlichen Luthertum," in *Frömmigkeit—Theologie—Frömmigkeitstheologie*, pp. 605–25; cf. Schorn-Schütte, *Evangelische Geistlichkeit*, pp. 429–39.

those with the power to deprive the pastor of position, house, and income. But examples of Lutheran pastors' taking seriously their call to admonish and summon even the powerful to repentance continue to surface in recent scholarship. Jonathan Strom's examination of the relationship between the Rostock ministerium and its city council in the 1650s reveals that the pastors often criticized local officials from the pulpit for various derelictions of duty and neglect of public order. These included failure to find a place to reside for a mentally disturbed woman and failure to punish properly those who cursed and blasphemed. Strom also shows that council and clergy worked together in harmony on many cases of mutual interest that sometimes commanded comment from the pulpit as well.[123]

Preachers also criticized other persons and groups directly from the pulpit. Strom recounts how in 1657 Enoch Suantenius, a preacher in Rostock, delivered a sermon that included criticism of academics for despising God's words and judging preachers. One listener made a written complaint, charging Suantenius with insulting him in his sermon. Ensuing proceedings on this and other charges raised issues of who had jurisdiction to decide such disputes.[124]

The greatest concern of preachers was the salvation of the individual, and the attendant consolation and assurance. Regardless of the occasion or the text, this theme came first and foremost in their preaching. This concern with salvation was not an otherworldly one for the preachers sought to address the real problems and issues of human life. Salvation was seen not merely as ensuring entrance into heaven after this earthly life but as providing real hope and consolation amidst the sorrows and troubles of earthly life. How pastors selected their expressions of the gospel and how they applied the work of Christ to their people's lives has only begun to be explored by scholars. How the entire creedal heart of their message took form should command interest, for such studies will give evidence of how the still predominant picture of 17th-century Lutheran theology as dogmatic theology contained in thick tomes actually affected the medium of the preacher and how it impacted people in the pew.

---

[123] Strom, *Orthodoxy*, pp. 121–39. Similar relationships typified clergy and council interactions in 17th-century Ulm, Haag, *Predigt*, pp. 209–16, and Monika Hagenmaier, *Predigt und Policey. Der geschaftspolitische Diskurs zwischen Kirche und Obrigkeit in Ulm 1640–1740* (Baden-Baden, 1989).

[124] Strom, *Orthodoxy*, pp. 106–12.

The proper distinction of law and gospel led the preachers into the middle of daily life. The sermon was the primary place in which Lutheran Orthodoxy brought its claim on the ordering of society into the public discourse.[125] Their sermons addressed the problems their people encountered with admonition and instruction,[126] but they also addressed larger issues in which their society was involved, including wars against the Turk and France.[127] Largely, however, their focus fell on family life,[128] everyday economic activities in town or village, and inter-personal relationships among neighbors. Pastors also cultivated the worship activity and devotional life of their people, aided them in coping with suffering, and prepared them for a blessed death.[129]

In calling for greater attention to other aspects of the preaching of this period, it dare not be forgotten that polemic marked this age. The habits of the medieval disputation, feelings of betrayal first from papal leadership and then from turncoats within the larger Protestant movement and even within Lutheran ranks cultivated a strong sense of the necessity of defending the faith with a good offense against false beliefs and practices old and new. Nonetheless, these sermons seldom fell under the dominance of such critiques of others. Patrick Ferry examines sermons against synergism in Saxony in the latter half of the 16th century.[130] He concludes that the cure of souls and orthodox teaching were the dual driving forces for sermon writers. Parishioners were regularly informed about the intricate details of doctrinal orthodoxy, but sermons indicate that preserving theological principles was never an end in itself. Hearers' spiritual interests were very much at stake. Similarly, Beth Kreitzer notes the inevitable inclusion of anti-Roman Catholic polemic in Lutheran sermons on Mary but explains it as stemming from the preachers not being "content to leave the traditional image of her in place, or to concede control over her image to their opponents. Instead Mary is used to show how it is true faith that justifies,

---

[125] Haag, *Predigt*, pp. 4–5, 256–62.

[126] Rublack, "Lutherische Predigt," pp. 348–64; Robert Kolb, "Preaching the Christian Life: Ethical Instruction in the Postils of Martin Chemnitz," in *Caritas et Reformatio. Essays on Church and Society in Honor of Carter Lindberg*, ed. David Whitford (St. Louis, 2002), pp. 133–153, and *LQ* 16 (2002): 275–301.

[127] Haag, *Predigt*, pp. 200–08.

[128] Ibid., pp. 217–34.

[129] Ibid., pp. 252–56, 262–79, 239–45.

[130] Patrick T. Ferry, "Confessionalization and Popular Preaching: Sermons against Synergism in Reformation Saxony," in *SCJ* 28 (1997), 1143–66.

and then leads one necessarily to good deeds".[131] The Thirty Years War sustained concern to counteract Roman Catholic attacks on Lutheran teaching, as the sermons of Johann Heermann reveal.[132]

Nischan's examination of how Lutheran sermons were used to strengthen Lutheran views against Calvinist and Catholic views of the Lord's Supper led him to conclude that "the premier task of preachers in this period… was to clarify those lines of demarcation that separated Lutheranism from other denominations".[133] He analyzed postil sermons for Maundy Thursday, Ascension Day, and the Feast of Corpus Christi, to show how Lutheran preachers urged their flocks to reject Calvinist and Roman Catholic teaching on the Lord's Supper. The sermons indicate that pastors expected a high degree of theological sophistication from their parishioners. But doctrinal correctness and drawing confessional lines was not the ultimate purpose of their preaching:

> Christ's Real Presence certainly was a, if not the, central issue in the confessional controversies of the period. Ministers were telling their parishioners not only that they were right, but also why they were right and what this meant in their daily lives. A good evangelical Christian, that was their message, received the sacrament not because it made him a better person or allowed him to commune spiritually with God; he received it because it confirmed and strengthened his faith in Christ's life giving grace.[134]

Nuanced doctrinal arguments were not generally used for their own sake nor even solely for the sake of instilling a sense of confessional identity. Even though "the major challenge for Lutheran pastors of the late Reformation had been to instill in their listeners a faith and piety consonant with the confessional stance of the new church but distinct from its principal rivals, the Catholics and Reformed," Nischan argued that more was at stake than simply doctrinal distinctiveness. These sermons provide a litmus test for "analyzing how pastors sought to instill a sense of confessional identity in their flocks, while, concurrently, salvaging what they regarded as the central accomplishment of the Reformation".[135]

---

[131] Kreitzer, *Reforming Mary*, pp. 62, 60–63.
[132] Liess, *Heermann*, pp. 146–51.
[133] Nischan, "Demarcating," 201.
[134] Ibid., p. 210.
[135] Ibid., p. 215.

However the balance fell between doctrine and application, polemic and the consolation or exhortation necessary for strengthening faith and new obedience in the hearer's daily life, some preachers also fretted over the general failure of many of their colleagues to preach well and to carry out their pastoral office with sufficient vigor and aptitude. The crisis in 17th-century preaching loomed large enough in the eyes of its practitioners to command serious attention from some. Theophil Großgebauer, pastor in Rostock, criticized the laity for relying simply on their hearing of the sermon and attendance at worship rather than taking the message they heard to heart and practicing the Christian faith. His *Voice of the Watchman* of 1661 bore the sub-title "Candid and Necessary Discovery, why the Extensive Preaching of God's Word in Evangelical Congregations Produces Little Conversion and Piety, and why the Evangelical Congregations Become Increasingly Less Spiritual and Godly with the Current Preaching of God's Holy Word". He called for pastors to follow up on their preaching by examining young and old, investigating their people's lives, admonishing and disciplining them through proper use of the office of the keys, and requiring fruits of preaching and the sacraments.[136]

The Hearers' Reactions to Preaching

Susan Karant-Nunn aptly judges that "in systematically and repeatedly publicizing theologians' beliefs and social values," "the spoken sermon reached a large segment of the Protestant populace," and that we may assume that this preaching "gradually influenced—though it never fully formed—people's convictions".[137] Further discussion of the effects of preaching in the Reformation and the age of confessionalization must wrestle with the methods for defining the question and ascertaining as much as possible about these reactions. Some tentative suggestions emerge, however, in recent research.

Norbert Haag discovered one of the rare examples of a "common person" who left behind a chronicle of events in his time. Born in 1597, son of a cobbler, Hans Heberle became a farming peasant. The comet of 1618 and the events of the beginning of the Thirty Years

---

[136] *Wächterstimme aus dem verwüsteten Zion*… (Frankfurt/M., 1661); Strom, *Orthodoxy*, pp. 9, 198–200.

[137] Karant-Nunn, "Preaching the Word in Early Modern Germany," in *Preachers and People*, p. 215.

War, which he believed the comet had prophesied, moved him to write something of a diary, reacting to the events of his time. Haag labels him a "Lutheran by conviction". His comments on the world around him reflect a strong belief in the presence and providence of God and the firm conviction that Jesus Christ had given him hope for this life and the next. "God is for him unquestionably the guide and Lord of history," Haag concludes.[138]

Hearers, of course, had to be present to react at all. Worship attendance varied from place to place in this period. Cyriakus Spangenberg insisted that in Mansfeld county in the 1560s the people in many villages gathered for morning prayer, usually without a sermon but with the singing of a psalm, prayer, Luther's hymn, "Lord, Keep Us Steadfast in Your Word," and the collect prayer for peace. At dusk they gathered again to thank God for the blessings of the day and to pray for his protection through the night. Other villages heard only the ringing of the bell to remind them to pray themselves, but in some of those villages they gathered for common prayer and catechetical proclamation in the evening.[139] Spangenberg did not give an estimate of how many participated regularly.

Figures from Württemberg in the period 1581–1601 present a variegated picture from place to place, but in general attendance on Sundays and festivals pleased those conducting official visitations. However, they noted that most parishioners showed up infrequently for Sunday afternoon and evening services, including the catechism services, or for weekday worship.[140] Haag's report on the visitation records for Ulm reflect a somewhat more negative picture for the mid to late 17th century though the records of visitors frequently justify their activities by finding fault. Haag does report that the end of the century saw a "heightened participation in church life and along with it a heightened acceptance of the church's norms".[141] A century earlier, in 1562, Nikolaus von Amsdorf complained not about church attendance but about the failure of parents to use their childrens' and servants' presence in church properly. Parents were neglecting their duty to prepare their

---

[138] Haag, *Predigt*, 61–76.

[139] *Die erste Epistel Paulj an Timotheum. Ausgelegt vnd gepredigt*…(Strasbourg, 1564), fol. xxx/b.

[140] Bruce Tolley, *Pastors & Parishioners in Württemberg During the Late Reformation 1581–1621* (Stanford, 1995), pp. 73–78.

[141] Haag, *Predigt*, pp. 107–112.

young charges for the Sunday sermon and to review with them how the pastors had proclaimed God's wrath against sin and his mercy toward them afterward. For, Amsdorf maintained, pastors' preaching alone cannot properly cultivate the faith of young people if the coordinated instruction of parents is not taking place in the home.[142]

Nischan notes that preachers in the period offered differing assessments of the effectiveness of worship and preaching in the lives of their people. Zacharias Rivander reported that "the common man" knew the pericopal lessons by heart "so that the peasants often can tell us the gospels that we preach on throughout the entire year". On the other hand, Christoph Fischer, superintendent in Lüneburg, concluded that "the simple people quickly forget what they have heard today and certainly will not remember it a year from now".[143] Both observations may have been true although Fischer may well have been describing a larger group than was Rivander. All these preachers agreed with Luther that their proclamation served God as a weapon in the eschatological battle against Satan's lies, and that more often than they wished his lies won small victories.

Conclusion

At the foundation of every culture or sub-culture lies the expression of their ultimate and essential perception of reality and the means for conveying this worldview to the members of the culture. The media for cultivating and integrating the constituent elements of such an understanding of reality serve a crucial function in indigenizing changes in the populace's assessment of reality, maintaining consciousness of the pillars of such principles, and educating new generations amidst changing circumstances in how to view the world around them. For the Lutheran churches of the 16th and 17th centuries the preaching of God's Word mediated God's presence and power, his view of the reality he had created, his gift of the relationship with himself that fulfilled the humanity of the individual. Therefore, the sermon served as the single most critical tool for mediating the understanding of

[142] Robert Kolb, "Parents Should Explain the Sermon, Nikolaus von Amsdorf on the Role of the Christian Parent," *LQ* O.S. 25 (1973), 231–240.
[143] Nischen, "Demarcating," p. 203.

reality which the church wished to nurture in its members, to enable them to participate both in the church and in the larger culture. As noted above, sermons, as oral events, disappear with fading memories. The notes that may remain cannot completely convey what happened when preaching took place. Printed sermons reflect what actually took place in a pulpit, but they are edited versions of the event. Printed sermons also do more than give a somewhat reliable record of what was preached. They fulfilled their purpose in serving as guides for the preaching of others, but even when read directly from the printed text, in another congregational setting they may have functioned differently than they did in the original.

Though increasingly more has been written in recent years about preaching in 16th- and 17th-century Lutheran lands, no secondary work has been comprehensive, nor has any work set a definite paradigm for the study of preaching in this era. Sermons from this period abound in libraries and archives, but scholars have mined only a small portion of this rich source material. Sermons promise to yield many further insights into a full range of questions regarding the course of the development of Lutheran ecclesiastical culture in the century and a half after Luther's death.

Nonetheless, the beginnings of serious study of Reformation and Confessional age sermons in Lutheran ecclesiastical culture is a welcome development. Research is moving beyond its previous largely exclusive focus on the highest level of university thinking within Lutheran churches of the period. With appropriate grains of salt and with more experimentation and scholarly exchange about the proper methods for assessing the meaning and impact of such sermons, research in this field can reveal much about the texture and tendencies of early modern Lutheran ecclesiastical life and its contribution to the societies and cultures in which it existed.

INSTRUCTION OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH BY LUTHERANS AFTER LUTHER

Gerhard Bode

Introduction

During the autumn of 1617 the churches in the southern German city of Ulm marked the one-hundredth anniversary of the beginning of the Reformation with fanfare. Festive worship services were held in the city's *Münster*, complete with special music and singing, prayers of thanksgiving, and jubilee sermons. The pastors preached about Martin Luther and the evangelical message he proclaimed, a message not merely for a century, but for all times. Even the children contributed to the celebration. At one of the services the pastors questioned boys and girls from the city's schools on Luther's Small Catechism in the presence of the entire congregation.[1] The importance placed on a catechetical exercise as part of the festivities indicates how people in Ulm—at least the pastors—understood the catechism in their day. Luther's Small Catechism defined the teachings of Luther's Reformation: the simple, clear message of the gospel. When the children of the congregation rehearsed the catechism, they were celebrating its teaching, but they were also identifying themselves as heirs of Luther's Reformation message.

The meaning of the term "catechism" had changed over time from its use in early Christianity. Originally the term referred to the oral instruction of catechumens in the faith before baptism. As Albrecht Peters notes, at the time of the Reformation the reformers used the word catechism in four ways: it was the elementary instruction in the Christian faith; it referred to special worship services in which the core teachings of the faith were taught; it denoted the content of the

[1] Cf. Conrad Dieterich, *Zwo Ulmische Jubel und Danckpredigten bey dem auff Christliche Anordnung eines Ehrsames Raths den 2. Novemb. 1617. Jahrs hochfeyrlich begangenem Evangelischen Jubelfest*… (Ulm, 1618), p. 91. Some material in this essay has been adapted from the author's dissertation: "Conrad Dieterich (1575–1639) and the Instruction of Luther's Small Catechism," (Ph.D. dissertation, Concordia Seminary, 2005).

instruction (the core parts of the catechism); and it meant the book presenting the content.[2] By 1500 the term "catechism" had designated the basic elements, or chief parts, of evangelical Christian teaching: the Decalog, Creed, Lord's Prayer, Baptism, and Lord's Supper. But through time Lutherans came to understand the term "catechism" as Luther's own exposition of these chief parts in the *Small Catechism* (1529). As an instructional handbook, Luther's catechism became an integral part of Lutheran religious culture for generations. Countless children committed Luther's fluent questions and answers to memory and repeated them before dutiful parents. Teachers in schools drilled students in their knowledge of the catechism's teaching and in their ability to reiterate it as part of their religious education. Preachers gave sermons on the text of the catechism, urging their hearers to hold fast to true doctrine and to recognize and avoid error.

Faced with the challenge of communicating the Reformation's spirit and substance to new generations of young people, Lutherans found new ways to teach the catechism, putting the ancient tradition of Christian instruction to use as they attempted to remain faithful to the heart of Luther's message. Catechisms were learned and memorized not primarily because they came from the pen of the great reformer, but rather because of the content they conveyed. Certainly Luther was a figure held in the highest esteem by many, but what he taught was of greater importance. The teaching, they believed, was an inheritance, a precious treasure bequeathed to all Christians.[3] The catechism summarized and explained the teachings of God's Word, and those teachings, simply and plainly articulated by Luther, were the jewels. Many Lutherans regarded the catechism as the Bible for the laity (*Laienbibel*). Since the biblical message of the catechism was the key thing to be passed on, the manner in which it was presented was often secondary for teachers and writers of catechetical materials. Of course, there was more to the teaching of Scripture than was included in Luther's catechism. It was

[2] Albrecht Peters, *Kommentar zu Luthers Katechismen. Band 1: Die Zehn Gebote, Luthers Vorreden*, ed. Gottfried Seebaß (Göttingen, 1990), pp. 16–17.

[3] For instance, Superintendent Conrad Dieterich of Ulm considered Luther's Small Catechism, "a golden treasure instructing thousands of souls to eternal life," ("… D. Luther das güldin Kleinod seines Catechismi an Tag geben/und dadurch viel tausend Seelen zum ewigen Leben unterrichte…"), in "Catechismus Predigt. Darin von fleissiger Ubung des Catechismi in denen Häuptstücken Christlicher Lehr gehandlet…," in *D. Cunrad Dieterichs.… Sonderbarer Predigten/… Vierdter Theil…* (Schleusingen, 1634), p. 120.

never regarded as a substitute for the Bible but rather as a summary of it and an introduction to the way of life it taught. Since it presented the chief teachings of the Christian faith from which all others derived, the catechism itself was regarded as the starting place, or, in some cases, even the foundation, for all further instruction in biblical teaching.

Lutherans in the eras of the Late Reformation and Orthodoxy continued the work begun by Luther and other reformers. Teachers and writers of catechetical material faithfully sought to convey the evangelical teaching to students. These efforts were not merely aimed at inculcating Lutheran dogma. Over time, Luther's Small Catechism became a core component not only of catechetical instruction but also of the practice of faith. With specific intentions and goals in mind, educators developed pedagogical principles and methods seeking to shape both the beliefs and lives of catechumens through their instruction. Textbooks expanded beyond the scope of the Small Catechism as educators responded to needs and concerns of their own time in an attempt to prepare young people for life in a changing religious culture. While they passed on a tradition to the next generation that often contained the teaching of Luther's catechism, it was also a tradition that introduced different approaches, content, and emphases. Lutherans did not merely accept Luther's Small Catechism but integrated it into their own situations.

Luther's Catechisms and Instruction in the Christian Faith

Luther and his Wittenberg colleagues had set the foundation for the Lutheran educational tradition during the earliest days of the Reformation. Luther's understanding of how God's Word works made the attainment of his primary goal of restoring the centrality of the Christian gospel and of reforming the church rest upon effective education.[4]

---

[4] See, e.g., Harold J. Grimm, "Luther and Education," in *Luther and Culture* (Decorah, 1960), pp. 74–75; James M. Kittelson, "Luther the Educational Reformer," in *Luther and Learning: The Wittenberg University Luther Symposium*, ed. Marilyn J. Harran (Selinsgrove, 1985), pp. 95–114; idem, "Luther's Impact on the Universities—and the Reverse," *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 48 (1984), 23–38; Robert Rosin, "The Reformation, Humanism, and Education: The Wittenberg Model for Reform," *Concordia Journal* 16 (1990), 301–18; idem, "Luther on Education," *LQ* 21 (2007), 197–210; Lewis W. Spitz, "Further Lines of Inquiry for the Study of Reformation and Pedagogy," in *The Pursuit of Holiness in Late Medieval and Renaissance Religion*, ed. Charles Trinkaus (Leiden, 1974), pp. 294–306. Some conclusions of Gerald Strauss, *Luther's House of Learning. Indoctrination of the Young in the German Reformation* (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University

He recognized that the doctrine of justification by grace through faith alone, with its reconception of the relationship of human beings to God and to one another, entrusted education with a principal role in church, society, and even families. Faith in God and love for neighbor had to be taught and learned, and education prepared and equipped people for service to God, his church, and community.[5]

Luther was not the first to publish a catechism during the Reformation. The Swabian Lutheran reformer Johannes Brenz, for instance, published his first catechism in 1527, and followed it with later editions. Brenz's catechisms were perhaps the most widely used Lutheran catechisms in the 16th century after Luther's.[6] They were popular in southern German lands and were influential for Lutheran catechesis in other areas. During the following decades Brenz's catechisms were often prescribed in church and school orders together with Luther's.[7]

As the Reformation progressed, Luther recognized the need for basic instruction in the Christian faith. His evangelical concern, with its stress on the Holy Scriptures as the sole authority in matters of faith, led him to encourage a broad educational program. In addition to education at home, schools played a decisive role. Luther's call for the establishment of new schools, the improvement of existing ones, and the reforming of school curricula gave new direction to dealing with the educational challenges facing the Reformation. Luther's plan was bold and advanced for the time. Children and adults alike had to be taught to read and understand the Bible. Cities were to maintain good schools to which parents should be compelled to send their children, both boys and girls. Like humanists of his time, Luther underscored the importance of learning languages, the liberal arts, and of teaching with methods that were engaging and considerate of students. Education promised benefits. Such opportunities for improving German society

---

Press, 1978) are challenged by this study and by others, including James M. Kittelson, "Successes and Failures in the German Reformation. The Report from Strasbourg," *ARG* 73 (1982), 153–175; Scott Hendrix, "Luther's Impact on the Sixteenth Century," *SCJ* 16 (1985), 3–14.

[5] See Luther, Large Catechism, The Ten Commandments, §172. Unless otherwise noted, all quotes or references from Luther's Large and Small Catechisms, and any other of the Lutheran confessional writings, are from *Book of Concord*.

[6] Johannes Brenz, *Fragstuck des Christlichen glaubens für die Jugendt zu Schwebishen Hall* (Augsburg, 1528).

[7] For a full discussion of Brenz's catechisms and the history of their use, cf. Christoph Weismann, *Die Katechismen des Johannes Brenz: 1. Die Enstehungs-, Text- und Wirkungsgeschichte* (Berlin, 1990).

and culture could not afford to be missed. Yet the foremost objective of Luther's emphasis on education was the instruction in the Christian faith and life. A comprehensive educational program was influential for the development of Christian character and culture, but ultimately these were to be used in service of God and fellow human beings. Teaching the Christian faith was to take first priority; once that was achieved instruction in the other elements of the curriculum would follow.

Building on the church's catechetical tradition, Luther firmly believed that an intentional program of catechesis was one of the best and most effective ways to introduce the evangelical faith to children and lay adults. Certainly people could learn from hearing Bible stories and general sermons, but working through the catechism was a clear and structured way of setting forth the goals of faith/life building. Luther began with several series of catechetical sermons in the 1520s, but the need for a good catechism text quickly became more apparent.

Through instruction on the basis of the catechism Luther intended to cultivate the Christian life. The central point of religious instruction concerned not merely the communication of Christian doctrine or the ethics of the Christian life, but the relationship between God and human beings. That included how they lived as people in God's creation, in the conduct of their daily life, both in relationship to him as they encountered his Word and responded in prayer, and also in their service to one another.[8] So Luther's catechisms were designed to shape and transform the understanding of this relationship in terms of law and gospel. Luther recognized that catechetical instruction is teleological, directed to a specific goal and purpose. He understood that the faith-relationship with God is ongoing, nourished by the believer's reception of God's gifts. Learning the Christian faith is a continuous exercise—even a way of life for pastors and for their people. Thus, broadly considered, Luther intended his catechisms as a guidebook for the Christian way of faith and life. Still, he had specific circumstances and audiences to which his catechetical writings initially appealed.

Two factors played a role in bringing Luther to compose his catechism. The first was the dispute within the Wittenberg circle regarding the proper use of the law in the Christian life, which pitted Luther and Melanchthon against one of their favorite students, Johann Agricola.

[8] See Charles P. Arand, *That I May Be His Own: An Overview of Luther's Catechisms* (St. Louis, 2000), pp. 27–28.

The second was the reformer's perception of the need for Christian education encountered in the visitations of electoral Saxony and Meissen in 1528–1529.[9] Luther set about providing pastors and preachers with materials useful for the task. The result was two catechisms published in 1529: one shorter, in dialogue form designed for lay adults and children;[10] the second, a more extensive explanation, homiletical and aimed primarily at pastors and preachers.[11] In each he wished to incorporate the fundamental teachings of Scripture and provide instruction in them.[12] In Luther's view all people, young and old, should learn what the catechism teaches, "for in these three parts [Decalog, Creed, and Lord's Prayer] everything contained in the Scriptures is comprehended in short, plain, and simple terms".[13] For Luther the catechism served in a way as a "theological-pedagogical key to the Scripture" and thereby also as a key to the life in the church.[14] Luther advised that once the catechism had been learned, people should be taught psalms or hymns based on the material to supplement and confirm their knowledge, adding, "Thus young people will be led into the Scriptures and make progress every day". With this understanding Luther saw the catechism as a summary not only of Scripture, but also of "the teaching, life, wisdom, and learning that constitute the Christian's conversation, conduct, and concern".[15] He recognized how important good instruction in the catechism is for the life of the church[16] since it was to teach people the fundamentals of the faith and instruct them in putting this faith into practice. For Luther, knowledge of the catechism is a mark of a Christian.[17] This knowledge gives the believer a command of the

---

[9] See Timothy J. Wengert, *Law and Gospel, Philip Melanchthon's Debate with John Agricola of Eisleben over Poenitentia* (Grand Rapids, 1997), pp. 77–210.

[10] *Der kleine Katechismus für gemeine Pfarherr und Prediger*, first published in May 1529, and later known as the Small Catechism (WA 30,1:243–425).

[11] The *Deudsch Catechismus*, first published in April 1529 and later known as the Large Catechism (WA 30,1:125–238).

[12] Already in his first series of catechetical sermons of 1528, Luther called the catechism the "kinder predigt oder der leyen biblia" (WA 30,1:27), understanding it as the instrument for bringing the biblical message to the laity. In the Large Catechism Luther described the catechism as "a brief digest and summary of the entire Holy Scriptures" (Long Preface, §18).

[13] Large Catechism, Short Preface, §18.

[14] Ivar Asheim, *Glaube und Erziehung bei Luther: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Verhältnisses von Theologie und Pädagogik* (Heidelberg, 1961), p. 272.

[15] Large Catechism, Short Preface, §25. Luther's translation of the Bible into German made this even more possible.

[16] "Lectures on Zechariah" (1527), WA 23:486; LW 20:157.

[17] Large Catechism, Short Preface, §2.

proper use of the entire Christian faith even though Luther did not conceive of his catechisms as formal confessions of the faith.[18] Nonetheless, defining confessing the faith as both what is confessed and the activity of confessing (somce form and content cannot be separated),[19] he believed that the catechism also made it possible, at least on a fundamental level, for people both to distinguish between true and false teaching and to project biblical teaching in their lives.

While Luther's catechisms provided instruction for a wide range of children and adults, Luther in fact had specific readers in view. In one respect Luther perhaps intended his Small Catechism more for teachers than for students. Certainly, young people were a primary audience, but it was not Luther's plan that the catechism become a textbook to be placed in the hands of every child. Rather, Luther designed it as a guidebook for pastors, parents, and teachers, from whom children would receive oral instruction. He cast the material in fixed forms of expression and in simple language to facilitate memorization and comprehension. Memorization for its own sake was not the primary goal but rather the means of appropriating and retaining the material. Lutheran teachers were concerned that people learn the text of the catechism thoroughly, appropriating it in a deliberate and personal way. Mastery of the teaching through memorization and examination would prepare catechumens for a more in-depth study of the parts of the catechism and serve as an introduction to the reading of Scripture.[20] Oral communication and aural learning remained the envisioned means of inculcation of Lutheran catechetical teaching, despite the development of printing and the gradual move toward a reading culture.

For pastors, Luther's catechisms were to have a dual purpose: to train them, and then in turn to be used by them to educate the laity. By addressing the Small Catechism to "Ordinary Pastors and Preachers" Luther assigned the parish clergy the task of mastering the catechism—both catechisms—and then teaching and preaching this in

[18] See Karl Bornhäuser, *Der Ursinn des Kleinen Katechismus* (Gütersloh, 1933), p. 3.

[19] See Robert Kolb, *Confessing the Faith: Reformers Define the Church, 1530–1580* (St. Louis, 1991), pp. 22–23.

[20] Otto Albrecht disproved the notion that memorization was the chief goal of Luther's catechesis, arguing that it was simply the means of taking up and understanding what was being taught; see "Besondere Einleitung in den Kleinen Katechismus," in WA 30,1:543–44.

the local congregations.[21] In addition, Luther encouraged clergy to employ the catechism as a devotional and prayer book and to drill themselves in it daily.[22] Nonetheless, his catechisms were designed and undertaken ultimately "for the instruction of children and the uneducated".[23] Luther charged the pastors and preachers "to take up your office boldly, to have pity on your people who are entrusted to you, and help us bring the catechism to the people, especially to the young".[24] In the *Deudsche Messe und ordnung Gottis diensts* (1526) Luther made the case that catechetical instruction is crucial in the life of the congregation as well as in the divine service.[25]

Church, home, and school have the duty to cooperate in teaching the Christian faith. He accented the family as the primary instrument for the catechization of the young and regarded the training up of their own children and their young servants in the faith as one of the most important parental responsibilities.[26] At the same time parents lay the foundation for their children's broader education—the curriculum of their lives—in community with other people.[27] Therefore, Luther

---

[21] On the continuation of the medieval custom of preaching the catechism, see Mary Jane Haemig, "The Living Voice of the Catechism: German Lutheran Catechetical Preaching 1530–1580" (Th.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1996), pp. 10–11; Arand, *That I May*, pp. 58–63.

[22] Large Catechism, Long Preface, §3, 19. Luther asserted that the Holy Spirit is at work in such study of the catechism (Large Catechism, Long Preface, §9).

[23] Large Catechism, Short Preface, §1. That Luther aimed his Small Catechism at parish clergy is evident from the title page: *Handbook. The Small Catechism for Ordinary Pastors and Preachers*". From the early Middle Ages parish clergy had traditionally served as teachers of the catechism to the laity. As Arand, *That I May Be*, p. 94, observes, "catechetical instruction emerged as one of the primary tasks of a Lutheran pastor".

[24] Small Catechism, Preface, §6. Cf. also Small Catechism, Preface, §10, 14–17; Large Catechism, Short Preface, §24, 26.

[25] *Deudsche Messe und ordnung Gottis diensts* (1526), WA 19:76, 78; LW 53:64, 67.

[26] Large Catechism, The Ten Commandments, §174. Cf. Large Catechism, Short Preface, §4. This an emphasis found in many of Luther's writings. See e.g., Large Catechism, The Sacrament of the Altar, §87: "Let all heads of a household remember that it is their duty, by God's injunction and command, to teach their children or have them taught the things they ought to know;" for a more expanded discussion, and Large Catechism, Ten Commandments, §167–78. Each page of the first German *Tafeldruck* edition of the Small Catechism (1529) bore the title of each section or part of the catechism followed by "wie sie ein Hausvater seinem Gesinde einfältiglich furhalten soll". This title was retained in subsequent printings of the catechism in pamphlet/book form. The 1529 Latin translation, intended largely for use in schools, is addressed to students and schoolteachers.

[27] By 1530 Luther would charge the temporal authorities with the task of compelling their subjects to keep their children in school. In Luther's view, this compulsory education was necessary for the good of children, for their parents, and for the benefit

assigned parents titles once reserved exclusively for clergy.[28] In order for parents to serve as teachers in the home, they themselves needed to have a basic knowledge of Christian faith and doctrine and to be able to explain this to their children. Thus, the catechism guided parents in their own learning as well.

Apart from pastors and parents, Luther urged another group to be involved actively in religious education: the governing authorities.[29] Because parents could not or would not fulfill this responsibility, Luther turned to church and school to make sure basic instruction in the faith took place.[30] In his *To the Councilmen of All Cities in Germany that they Establish and Maintain Christian Schools* (1524), Luther had exhorted civic authorities to provide schools and competent teachers and to assure that children received adequate training. He had no illusions about the difficulty of operating schools and the challenges faced by administrators and teachers, noting that "it takes extraordinary people to bring children up right and teach them well".[31] Failure to educate children would, according to Luther, result in the ultimate ruin of both children and community.[32]

Although not written specifically as a school textbook, the Small Catechism quickly assumed a place in the new evangelical school curriculum. Luther's text was translated into Latin in 1529. While Luther designed his catechism for oral instruction, it was also easily accessible to students learning to read the vernacular. In the *Instructions for the Visitors of Parish Pastors in Electoral Saxony* (1528), Melanchthon had directed schoolmasters on how to teach on the parts of the catechism, and certainly Luther's text proved a helpful tool for teachers as well as students.[33] The Small Catechism soon became the fundamental textbook for religious instruction for schools.

---

of the whole community. Luther, *A Sermon on Keeping Children in School* (1530), LW 46: 256–57.

[28] See Arand, *That I May Be*, p. 96, and n. 29. Luther, *Predigt über das 1. Buch Mose. Kap 10.* (1527) WA 24:223, 9–13, *Ten Sermons on the Catechism* (1528), WA 30,1:58; LW 51:136–37.

[29] Small Catechism, Preface, §19–20; Large Catechism, Long Preface, §19; Short Preface, §4.

[30] Large Catechism, The Sacrament of the Altar, §86. See *To the Councilmen of All Cities in Germany that they Establish and Maintain Christian Schools* (1524), LW 45:354–55; WA 15:33–34; Small Catechism, Preface, §19–20. See Arand, *That I May Be*, p. 93.

[31] WA 15:34; LW 45:355.

[32] WA 15:34–35; LW 45:354–56.

[33] *Instructions for the Visitors of Parish Pastors in Electoral Saxony* (1528), WA 26:237, 238–39; LW 40:315, 318.

In each of these venues Luther's catechisms quickly became a means of communicating the Reformation message and passing on the faith to the next generation. Throughout the 16th century, Luther's catechisms were widely reprinted, translated, and issued in revised and expanded editions. Luther's Small Catechism appeared in at least thirty German editions before Luther's death, and an additional 125 more before the end of the 16th century.[34] Luther's Large Catechism saw twenty-nine editions during Luther's lifetime and twenty-five more afterwards in the century.[35] Preaching biographical sermons on Luther in 1562–64, Johann Mathesius reported that more than one hundred thousand copies of the Small Catechism had been printed. In a time when few published works were issued in printings of more than a thousand, this figure of more than one hundred thousand gives evidence of the importance of Luther's catechism even though many could not read it and lived in territories which did not employ it for instruction.[36] Luther's catechism was firmly established in many areas as the fundamental textbook for religious instruction in homes, schools, and churches. Many of the practices regarding the use of the Small Catechism were established in *Kirchenordungen* and put into practice in local congregations.[37] In similar ways regional or civic *Schulordnungen* set down prescriptions and guidelines regarding the uses of the catechism in schools.

In Luther's view the catechism represented the foundation and starting point of Christian education. He never insisted that his Small Catechism serve as the sole basis for religious instruction but rather

---

[34] Robert Kolb, *Martin Luther as Prophet, Teacher, and Hero: Images of the Reformer, 1520–1620* (Grand Rapids, 1999), p. 158. The catechism was also published in Latin, Low German, Greek, Hebrew, and other translations during the 16th century.

[35] Ibid., p. 157. The Large Catechism was translated also into Latin and Low German.

[36] Robert Kolb, "The Layman's Bible: The Use of Luther's Catechisms in the German Late Reformation," in *Luther's Catechisms—450 Years. Essays Commemorating the Small and Large Catechisms of Dr. Martin Luther*, ed. David P. Scaer and Robert D. Preus (Fort Wayne, 1979), p. 18. Cf. Johann Mathesius, *Historien/Von des Ehrwürdigen in Gott Seligen thewren Manns Gottes, Doctoris Martini Luthers/anfang/lehr/leben vnd sterben*… (Leipzig, 1621), fols. 60a, 58a.

[37] E.g., the 1560/72 *Kirchenagende* for Hesse, the catechism of which contained basic questions and answers explaining or expanding on the text of Luther's Small Catechism. Reu lists other 16th-century *Kirchenordnungen* incorporating Luther's Small Catechism, including Pfalz-Zweibrücken (1557), Rothenburg (1559), Göttingen (1568), Pomerania (1569), Kurpfalz (1577), Mansfeld (1580), Braunschweig-Lüneburg (1594), and Strasbourg (1598), Johann Michael Reu, *Dr. Martin Luther's Small Catechism: A History of Its Origin, Its Distribution and Its Use* (Chicago, 1929), p. 67. More churches would officially adopt the Small Catechism in the early 17th century.

offered it as a teaching tool for those "unable to do any better".[38] He encouraged them to take up a more advanced and detailed catechism once people had been instructed in the catechetical basics. This would allow pastors to provide the people with a deeper and more complete understanding and to treat each individual commandment, petition, or part in greater detail. Luther also advised pastors to supplement this with many examples from Scripture.[39] His adherents soon followed his advice, and the catechetical exercise that he had placed at the heart of the practice of the congregation and individual believer attained a dynamic all its own within the Lutheran churches.

Expansions of Luther's catechetical teaching in the Later 16th Century

Throughout the 16th and 17th centuries editions of the Small Catechism were printed in expanded form, with supplementary questions and answers, prayers, hymns, and other elements of religious education. Additional Scripture passages inserted into the text of the catechism served to illustrate and reinforce Luther's teaching. These expanded manuals were essentially commentaries, explaining and building upon Luther's own words in the catechism.

Luther's Disciples Expand his Catechism

The process began not long after Luther's texts appeared, at the hands of contemporary adherents, including some of his students. The Nuremberg *Catechismus oder Kinder predig* of Andreas Osiander and Dominicus Schleupner appeared in 1532.[40] Osiander was the reformer of Nuremberg and one of the city's chief theologians and preachers. Schleupner

[38] See Small Catechism, Preface, §6: "I ask that those unable to do any better take up these charts [*Tafeln*] and versions [*Forme*] and read them to the people word for word…"

[39] See Small Catechism, Preface, §6, 17–18: "After you have taught the people a short catechism like this one, then take up a longer catechism and impart to them a richer and fuller understanding. Using such a catechism, explain each individual commandment, petition, or part with its various works, benefits, and blessings, harm and danger, as you find treated at length in so many booklets. In particular, put the greatest stress on that commandment or part where your people experience the greatest need…Always adduce many examples from the Scriptures…"

[40] Osiander and Schleupner, *Catechismus oder Kinder predig* (Nuremberg, 1533). This catechism was also appended to Nuremberg's 1533 *Kirchenordnung*.

served as the first evangelical preacher in Nuremberg (1522). In 1531 Osiander and Schleupner had published the text of the Small Catechism with a few additions.[41] The *Catechismus oder Kinder predig* of 1532 expanded that first publication, placing Osiander's and Schleupner's instruction in sermonic form. The text consists of sermons for children and young people on the parts of the catechism, each concluding with Luther's explanations. The book is a homiletical commentary on Luther's catechism. Despite the inclusion of Luther's text, he is not named as the author of the explanations to the parts of the catechism. Osiander and Schleupner slightly modified Luther's wording, simplifying or adding to the text as they saw fit. Among the additions was a sermon on the Office of the Keys placed between Luther's discussion of Baptism and the Lord's Supper.[42] Many later editions of Luther's *Small Catechism*, printed in other Lutheran regions, included an independent explanation of the Office of the Keys as one of the chief parts, perhaps initially as a result of the Nürnberg sermons for children.[43]

The Nuremberg catechism sermons were widely reprinted in the German lands and became the basis for further Lutheran catechisms. The sermons were translated often and officially introduced into many German cities and principalities.[44] In 1539 Justus Jonas translated the sermons into Latin for the Brandenburg-Nuremberg catechism. Thomas Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury, had this text translated into English for use in the Church of England. "Cranmer's Catechism" was published in 1548, yet soon gave way to the catechetical influences of Martin Bucer and John Calvin.[45]

---

[41] Osiander and Schleupner, *Ein kurtzer Begriff der Hauptstück/ so in den Catechismum/ das ist in die kinder leer gehören. Getruckt zu Nürmberg/ An welchem ort diser Catechismus auch also der jugent wirt geprediget* (Nuremberg, 1531).

[42] In their 1531 version of Luther's catechism, Osiander and Schleupner had added the part on the Office of the Keys before the discussion of Baptism. Luther's *Short Order of Confession* (from the 1529 Small Catechism) was omitted in both the 1531 and 1533 Nuremberg editions.

[43] On Osiander's view of absolution, see Ronald K. Rittgers, *The Reformation of the Keys. Confession, Conscience, and Authority in 16th-Century Germany* (Cambridge, MA, 2004).

[44] Reu maintains that no other exposition of Luther's Small Catechism "was of greater influence within Germany and beyond its boundaries during the 16th century and after" and notes that it was translated into Low German (1534), Latin (1539), English (1548), Dutch (1558), Polish (1561), and Icelandic (1562), (Reu, *Luther's Small Catechism*, p. 61). Haemig adds that the Nuremberg children's sermons in German appeared in thirty-six printings, "Living Voice," p. 321.

[45] *Catechism; That is to say a short Introduction into Christian Religion for the singular commoditie and profyte of children and yong people. Set forth by the moste reverende faterh in God Thomas*

Johannes Spangenberg, reformer in Nordhausen and Mansfeld, a friend of Luther since their days together at the University of Erfurt, published several religious instructional texts, including two expansions of Luther's catechisms. His *Des kleinen Catechismi kurtzer begrieff* (1542) was based on the Small Catechism, but he adapted the text.[46] Spangenberg added his own questions and answers and altered Luther's wording and arrangement at points, without greatly expanding the subject matter of the text. Following the medieval tradition, Spangenberg divided the Creed into twelve articles, but he did follow Luther's threefold division when explaining it. Spangenberg's works found wide usage. Like other writers of catechisms, Spangenberg stressed the importance of the catechetical teaching for the faith and lives of believers. In the preface to his exposition of the Small Catechism, Spangenberg made this clear: "The supreme and most necessary teaching—the only sure comfort and the greatest work of God under the sun—is that God has given his only-begotten Son for the forgiveness of our sins".[47] The catechism contains the whole teaching of the Bible in summary form, everything the Christian needs for a life of faith in the love of God and for the promotion of the gospel.

Lutherans also published study editions of Luther's *Large Catechism* for pupils and pastors although these were not as prevalent as amplifications of his smaller catechism. Johannes Spangenberg's *Der Gros Catechismus vnd Kinder Lere (1541)* is an example.[48] Here Spangenberg provided a more advanced course of instruction in this book, building on Luther's material but adapting it for use by students and young people. He discoursed on Luther's text, often following it closely, and

---

Archbyschop of Canterbury, Primate of all England and Metropolitane (1548). Cranmer had visited Osiander in Nuremberg in the early 1530s, married his niece, and was already familiar with his sermons on the catechism.

[46] Spangenberg, *Des kleinen Catechismi kurtzer begrieff vnd der Haustaffel/wie man sie in der gemeine zu Halle fur die kinder handelt* (Halle, 1542).

[47] "Die höchste, nötigste Lere, der einige gewisser trost vnd das höchste werck Gottes vnter der Sonnen ist, das Gott seinen eingebornen Son gegeben zur versönung fur vnsere sunde". Spangenberg, *Des kleinen Catechismi kurtzer begrieff*, fol. A2, quoted from Reu, *Quellen zur Geschichte des kirchlichen Unterrichts in der evangelischen Kirche Deutschlands zwischen 1530 und 1600.* 9 vols. (Gutersloh, 1904–1935), 1,2,2:86. Reu's *Quellen*, although in need of updating, provides an invaluable overview of the Lutheran catechetical and religious literature of the 16th century.

[48] Spangenberg, *Der Gros Catechismus vnd Kinder Lere/D.M. Luth. Fur die jungen Christen/ jnn Fragestücke verfasset*…(Wittenberg, 1541). This German edition was printed at least eighteen times between 1541 and 1580, and also appeared in Latin, Low German, Dutch, and Danish translations.

extending the treatment where Luther ignored points of doctrine or treated them briefly. Spangenberg's teaching method rested upon question-and-answer dialogue and supplied the material with woodcuts illustrating the teaching. As the next stage, offering an even more advanced instruction, Spangenberg composed his *Margarita theologica* (1540), based on Melanchthon's *Loci Communes* of 1521 and presented in the form of questions and answers.[49] Spangenberg aimed this work chiefly at pastors, preachers, and ministers in churches, but the material could also be used in higher schools.

Luther's Students Expand His Catechism

Luther's student Joachim Mörlin first published his elaboration of the Small Catechism in 1547.[50] Mörlin was superintendent in Göttingen, for whose churches and schools he wrote his catechism, before moving on to Prussia and then Braunschweig. Like other contemporaries, he regarded highly both Luther and his Small Catechism, suggesting the Holy Spirit had guided Luther's hand and pen while he composed it. In the preface to his catechism Mörlin referred to Luther not only as a noble instrument of God but also as "a godly little bee who had drawn forth noble saving honey from all the roses and lovely flowers of God's paradise" and poured it into the little jar of his Small Catechism.[51] Mörlin divided his catechetical teaching into three parts: law, gospel, and the "Household Chart" of Christian callings. He expanded Luther's explanations and added biblical texts as support. Although he enlarged on Luther's text and broadened the discussion of the individual parts, Mörlin preserved Luther's words and, for the most part, his methodology; his expanded text does not diminish the simplicity of the original catechism.

The catechism of Johannes Marbach was also widely used and adapted. Marbach, Luther's student at Wittenberg and pastor at Strasbourg after 1545, was also professor of theology at the *Gymnasium* in

---

[49] Spangenberg, *Margarita theologica, continens praecipvos locos doctrinae christianae, per quaestiones, breuiter & ordine explicatos*… (Leipzig, 1540). In addition to the Latin text, this work also appeared in German, English, Danish, and Swedish editions.

[50] Mörlin, *Der kleine Catechismus Doct. Martini Lutheri/Sampt der Haustaffel/in mehr Fragestück vorfasset* (Magdeburg, 1554).

[51] Mörlin, quoted in Kolb, *Luther as Prophet*, p. 155, see also p. 159.

Strasbourg when he wrote his *Catechismus* in 1557.[52] Like previous catechisms, Marbach's consists largely of Luther's text with supplementary questions and answers. As part of his attempt to strengthen the Lutheran movement in Strasbourg, Marbach replaced Martin Bucer's catechisms with that of Luther, and then based his own version on the Small Catechism. This marked an important step in Marbach's "second Reformation" of Strasbourg, as he led the city from Bucer's initial reform to a specifically Wittenberg mode of ecclesiastical life. In the late 16th and early 17th centuries Luther's version replaced previously adopted Evangelical catechisms in other German regions as well.

Another important work building on the Small Catechism came from Johann Tetelbach, pastor in Dresden, Meissen, and later superintendent in Chemnitz. His catechism, *Das Güldene Kleinod D. Mart. Lutheri Catechismus*, first published in 1568, was used in many areas and saw numerous editions and reprintings.[53] Tetelbach, too, regarded Luther's catechism as the *Laienbibel*, summarizing the teachings of Scripture for the lay people.[54] He supported establishment of Luther's Small Catechism as the authoritative basis for instruction in the faith. His detailed treatment of Luther's text expands the explanations with further questions and answers at some length. However, Tetelbach's exposition is closely connected with Luther's words and is not overly dogmatic in nature. Intended for schools, the *Güldene Kleinod* offered extensive analysis and explication of Luther's catechism in a clear and careful manner.

Matthäus Judex (Richter) composed a small *corpus doctrinae*, or body of doctrine, based on Luther's catechism.[55] A student both of Luther and Melanchthon, Judex assisted Johannes Wigand in composing the *Magdeburg Centuries* and with other projects. Presupposing knowledge of

---

[52] Marbach, *Catechismus. Christliche Vnderrichtung/ oder Lehrtafel/ kürtzlich in sechs nachfolgende Stuck verfasset* (Strasbourg, 1557).

[53] Tetelbach, *Das Güldene Kleinod. D. Martini Lutheri Catechismus. Jn kurtze Frage gefasset*… (Regensburg, 1568). Tetelbach's catechism also appeared in Low German and Swedish translations.

[54] Using Galatians 6:6 as a basis, Tetelbach defined catechesis as the simple oral instruction in the Christian religion and its repetition, or, a brief summary of the whole teaching of the Bible. This latter understanding would be underscored in the Formula of Concord, Epitome (Concerning the Binding Summary, Rule, and Guiding Principle…, 5) which called Luther's Small and Large Catechisms "a Bible of the Laity [*Laien Bibel*] in which everything is summarized that is treated in detail in Holy Scripture and that is necessary for a Christian to know for salvation".

[55] Judex, *Das kleine Corpus Doctrinae. Das ist: Die Heuptstücke vnd Summa Christlicher Lehre/ Für die Kinder in Schulen vnd Heusern*… (Erfurt, 1565).

Luther's catechism, Judex designed his *Corpus Doctrinae* to be an instructional book for use in homes and schools, offering questions and answers on forty-five doctrinal topics, along with readings from the Scriptures and the catechism. These teachings built on the catechetical foundation and were intended to help young people learn Lutheran doctrines but also enable them to recognize and refute false teachings. Testifying to its extensive use, Judex's work appeared in at least seventy-seven printings, including editions in Latin, Low German, Dutch, Swedish, Finnish, Estonian, Greek, and Hebrew.[56]

Bartholomäus Rosinus (Roßfeld), pastor and church administrator in Regensburg, also a student of Luther's and Melanchthon's, first published his *Kurtze Fragen und Antwort* in 1577. It was widely used and reprinted as late as 1727.[57] Rosinus designed his catechism primarily for use in the home, arranging the catechism in six parts, one for each weekday, with suggested psalms and hymns to accompany the catechetical lesson as part of the morning and evening devotions. Parents who wish rightly to bring up their children in the training and admonition of the Lord should make use of the catechism, Rosinus urged. In the foreword to his *Kurtze Fragen und Antwort*, he said that those who desire that their children live a Christian life and enter everlasting joy and salvation should teach them "nothing more necessary nor certain than the catechism, and daily drill them in it, which is indeed a brief summary statement of the entire holy Scripture, a truly precious jewel and the little Bible of the laity".[58] Similar to many of the previous catechisms surveyed, Rosinus' text contains simple questions and answers explaining Luther's catechism.

Luther's exposition remained foundational for these expansions and commentaries done by Tetelbach, Rosinus, and those who followed this line, though the simplicity of Luther's words would often be pushed to the side as the elaborations grew more extensive. To evaluate this development several factors must be taken into consideration, above

---

[56] Cf. Reu's discussion in *Quellen zur Geschichte*, 1,3,1,1:444–72.

[57] Rosinus, *Kurtze Fragen vnnd antwort/vber die sechs Heubtstück des Heiligen Catechismi Doctoris Martini Lutheri. Für die Christliche anfahende jugend*… (Regensburg, 1581).

[58] "…So können sie dieselbige nichts nötigers noch gewissers lehren, dann gemelten Catechismum mit jhnen täglich vben, Welcher freylich der gantzen heiligen Schrifft kurtzer Summarischer außzug, das rechte guldene Kleinot vnnd demnach der Leyen kleine Bibel ist". Rosinus, *Kurtze Fragen vnnd antwort*, fol. A2, quoted from Reu, *Quellen zur Geschichte*, 1,1:743. For a broader discussion of the Small Catechism as the Bible of the laity, see Kolb, "Layman's Bible," pp. 16–26.

all, the ecclesiastical-political climate in which Roman Catholic governments and churchly forces were making determined efforts to eliminate evangelical churches. However, the original intention of such doctrinal formulations should also be kept in mind. The organization of biblical material into topics or *loci* for the purpose of teaching of the Scripture's content arose out of the methodological ideals of biblical humanism. James Kittelson has noted humanism's enduring influence in education during the Reformation. Humanism and its educational ideal remained "conjoined to the Reformation, just as it had been in Luther's own mind".[59] This aspect of the humanistic heritage remained vital for Lutheran education. Kittelson observes, "The great irony is that, without the humanistic educational methods, without the languages, history, and rhetoric, and without the *loci* method in particular, the very emphasis upon doctrine that so characterized the Reformation at the most popular levels would be inconceivable".[60]

Lutherans also utilized the catechism as a tool for cultivating daily repentance in the life of believers. For instance, Wittenberg student Georg Walther wrote a confessional and prayer booklet that included questions and answers from Luther's catechism and other instructional texts.[61] The booklet guides those preparing for confession through a brief, but thorough, review of the chief parts of the catechetical teaching. Walther explained that those who have neither knowledge nor understanding of the catechism are not true Christians and ought not be admitted to the Lord's Supper.[62] As part of his instruction Walther incorporated stanzas of catechetical hymns among the answers to questions.[63]

Luther's earliest adherents and his students put his catechisms to work in their cultivation of the faith. They followed his advice in expanding his treatment of the chief articles of Christian teaching,

---

[59] Kittelson, "Luther the Educational Reformer," p. 107.

[60] Ibid.

[61] Walther, *Beicht und Bettbüchlein/Darinn schöne und kurtze erklerung/in Frag und antzwort/auß dem Catechismo Lutheri und andern Schrifften gezogen*… (Frankfurt am Main, 1581). Walther also published a series of sermons based on the five chief parts of the catechism: *Auslegung der fünff Hauptstücke des Catechismi*… (Leipzig, 1580).

[62] *Beicht und Bettbüchlein*, fol. D3.

[63] For example, "Question: How does the church sing of the First Commandment? Answer: I am alone your God and Lord; No other gods shall you have. You shall wholly trust in me, and love me with all your heart". ibid., fol. D5. Walther here quotes the second stanza of Luther's hymn on The Ten Commandments: "Dies sind die heil'gen zehn Gebot'" (1524).

and they viewed the instruction they were supporting with his text as far more than simply conveying biblical information and doctrine. The life of repentance that Luther had described in the fourth question on baptism in the *Small Catechism* remained their goal for the teaching of the faith.

Catechism and Controversy

Catechisms played so vital a role in the life of the church that controversy arose when changes in the program of catechesis were introduced. Ecclesiastical officials in the German lands increasingly prescribed Luther's Small Catechism as the official text for use in the churches and schools of their territories. The controversial publication of a supplement to it, a new Latin catechism in 1571, in electoral Saxony largely served to reinforce and further this trend by eliciting powerful negative reactions. In 1571 the so-called "Wittenberg Catechism" was made the official catechism of the principality. It appeared in print without a named author, but with a preface by the University of Wittenberg theological faculty.[64] Its chief author was in fact Christoph Pezel, preacher and theology professor at Wittenberg. Building on the foundation set down by Luther's catechism, the new Wittenberg text supplemented the instruction with an epitome of Melanchthon's *Corpus Doctrinae Christianae (1560)*.[65] The catechism was intended for use in schools by several levels of students, but especially for the more advanced.

The Wittenberg Catechism fell under intense scrutiny soon after its publication. Gnesio-Lutherans charged it with being "Crypto-Calvinistic" especially on the doctrines of Christ and the Lord's Supper. Here,

---

[64] *Catechesis: Continens Explicationem Simplicem, Et breuem Decalogi: Symboli Apostolici: Orationis Dominicæ: Doctrinæ de Pœnitentia. Et Sacramentis. Contexta ex Corpore Doctrinæ Christianæ, Qvod Amplectvntur ac tuentur Ecclesiæ regionum Saxonicarum & Misnicarum… Edita In Academia Vvitebergensi: & accommodata ad usum Scholarum puerilium* (s.l., 1571). See Johannes Hund, *Das Wort ward Fleisch. Eine systematisch-theologische Untersuchung zur Debatte um die Wittenberger Christologie und Abendmahlslehre in den Jahren 1567 und 1574* (Göttingen, 2006), pp. 209–310, and Dingel's essay above.

[65] The *Corpus Doctrinae Christianae* (or *Corpus Doctrinae Philippicum* or *Misnicum*) was a collection of selected works of Melanchthon published after his death, including the Augsburg Confession (*Variata*), the Apology of the Augsburg Confession, Melanchthon's *Loci Communes*, his *Examen ordinandorum*, et al., as well as the three ecumenical creeds. Cf. Irene Dingel, "Philip Melanchthon and the Establishment of Confessional Norms," LQ 20 (2006), 146–69; Harm Klueting, "'Wittenberger Katechismus' (1571) und 'Wittenberger Fragstücke' (1571): Christoph Pezel (1539–1604) und die Wittenberger Theologie," *ZKG* 112 (2001), 1–43.

they maintained, were ideas reflecting Calvin's teaching more than Luther's, threatening doctrinal purity; they claimed that the catechism exposed the Wittenberg theologians for what they were: "Calvinists hiding under the name 'Lutheran'".[66] Theologians and pastors on both sides flew into action and a flurry of attacks on the catechism and defenses of it quickly ensued. The efforts of theologians Nicholas Selnecker, Martin Chemnitz, and others eventually led to the rejection of the Wittenberg Catechism in Saxony. This concern for faithful Lutheran catechetical teaching, in part, led to the inclusion in the Book of Concord of Luther's catechisms as official confessional writings of the Lutheran churches. Those, including Chemnitz and Selnecker, who assembled the Book of Concord believed that the identification of what it meant to be Lutheran, an adherent of the Augsburg Confession, rested in part on the teaching of the faith according to Luther's model in his catechisms.

Preaching the Catechism

Preaching catechetical sermons was a widespread practice in Lutheran churches during the 16th and 17th centuries. Following Luther's exhortation, pastors expanded upon its teaching in sermons in order to communicate the evangelical message to all their parishioners, children and adults alike. Preachers proclaimed the Word of God as summarized and exposited in the catechism with the expectation that, by the Holy Spirit's working through the Word, it would create and strengthen faith in their hearers. At the same time these sermons were intended to direct and shape the daily lives of the people, preparing them to put their faith into practice.[67]

In addition to the aforementioned sermons by Osiander and Schleupner in Nuremberg, several preachers whose collections of sermons on the catechism were often printed command attention. Cyriakus Spangenberg, Johannes Spangenberg's son, preacher in Eisleben and Mansfeld, published detailed sermons based on Luther's catechism, intended to give believers a fuller knowledge and appreciation of the teaching

[66] Klueting points out that some of the questions and answers in the Wittenberg Catechism on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper and of the two natures of Christ were borrowed from the Reformed *Heidelberg Catechism* (1563), ibid., pp. 24–27, 31.

[67] Cf. Haemig, "Living Voice".

of the Scriptures as summarized by the great reformer.[68] Christoph Vischer (Fischer), pastor and superintendent at Meiningen and later at Celle, emphasized the importance of holding fast to Luther's catechism and avoiding any others teaching in contrast to it, perhaps an allusion to the Wittenberg Catechism which appeared shortly before Vischer's collection of catechetical sermons.[69] Simon Musaeus (Meusel), professor at Jena, and later superintendent in Gera and Mansfeld, stressed that knowledge of the catechism was vital for Christian faith and life in his catechetical preaching. A mastery of the catechism, the mark of Christians, equipped them for whatever might confront them in their daily existence.[70] These collections of sermons on the catechism reveal the preachers' serious intentions in their catechesis. They firmly believed that the central message of the catechism, the gospel conveying Christ's benefits, is the active Word of God that works in the hearer, forming and sustaining faith, and teaching how to live out this faith in the world.

Special services with catechetical sermons and hymns, as well as public examination, were also given as part of instruction for young people in congregations. The catechetical sermons of Aegidius Hunnius are significant in this regard.[71] Hunnius was preacher and professor of theology at Marburg and later at Wittenberg. His twelve sermons on the chief parts of the catechism were intended specifically for the instruction of children or youth. He presented the message of the catechism in a simple and winsome manner, frequently referring to the Scriptures. Yet at times Hunnius still seems to wear his doctor's cap in the pulpit and introduces rather detailed discussions of doctrines, especially on the Lord's Supper, perhaps challenging, or even trying, his young hearers at times.

---

[68] *Catechismus. Die Funff Heuptstück der Christlichen Lere/Sampt der Haußtafel/vnd dem Morgen und Abendt Gebet/Benedicite vnd Gratias, etc.* (Schmalkalden, 1566).

[69] *Auslegung der Fünff Heuptstücke des Heiligen Catechismi/Gestellet vnd geprediget Durch M. Christofferum Vischer*… (Leipzig, 1573).

[70] *Catechistisch Examen mit kurtzen Fragen vnnd Antwort/von den aller notwendigsten vnd wichtigsten Artickeln Christlicher Lere/sampt den fürnembsten jrthumben vnd Corruptele/durch welch der Teufel itziger zeit am allermeisten den Catechismum felschet/die Kirche Gottes zerstöret/vnnd die Leuthe mit grossen haussen in die helle führet/Für die Kinder vnnd einfältigen Christen gestellet*… (Ursel, 1568).

[71] *Catechismus/Oder Kinderlehre/Von den Häuptpuncten Christlicher Religion*… (Frankfurt am Main, 1592).

Worship services with catechetical sermons became a long-standing tradition and were required by church law in many places. In early 17th century in Ulm, for example, the churches held such services on Sunday afternoons, to supplement what students learned in schools as part of their religious instruction. Bonifatius Stölzlin gave well over a hundred catechetical sermons in Ulm and had them published as examples for other preachers to follow.[72] Stölzlin was concerned not only for the teaching of faith but also that such faith would produce good fruits in the lives of believers. As part of their duties, and as a follow-up to catechetical services, pastors often visited homes and examined children and servants on the catechism. These visits offered a gauge of how well the children learned, how much they knew, and how well the pastor or teacher was doing his job.

The preceding survey raises two related questions: why did Luther's Small Catechism continue to be used, and why was it not used in some Lutheran principalities? Catechism usage varied by region and church administrators. Cities and principalities adopted their own *Kirchen-* and *Schulordnungen* and instituted the use of certain catechetical materials in their churches and schools. Various reformers and writers of catechisms had influences in different areas of Germany, and often this factor determined whose catechism would be employed. For instance, many regions required that only Luther's catechism be used for instruction, while other prescribed other texts, such as that of Brenz. Luther's own significance and his followers' desire to remain faithful to his evangelical message certainly played a role in the preservation of his catechisms in parish instruction. But perhaps the simplest reason why Luther's Small Catechism was so widely used for such a long period of time (and continues to be used today) is that it was considered an excellent and eminently useful instructional tool.[73] Simply stated, Luther's catechism gave pastors and teachers what they needed for communicating the basics of the Christian faith and life to children and lay adults.

---

[72] *Catechismus-Hand. Das ist: Ordenliche/einfältige und Schriftmässige Erklärung/Des kleinen Catechismi D. Martin Luthers/der Sechs Hauptstukken/der Hauß-Tafel/des Underrichts für die Communicanten/und der Kinder-Gebetlein. In CXXXVII. Predigten verfaßt…Für andächtige/Fruchtbringende Hertzen/die sich ihrer Christlichen Lehr nicht nur mit dem Mund zu rühmen/sondern auch derselben erbauliche Früchten offentlich zu weisen befleissigen…* (Ulm, 1666).

[73] See Kolb, "Layman's Bible," pp. 25–26.

Later Lutheran Catechetical Instruction

Luther's Small Catechism in a changing context

Luther had written his catechisms for a specific historical and theological context, a period when many did not know the basics of the Christian faith, let alone the more complex ideas of the biblical, evangelical message of Luther and the other reformers. By the late 16th century, however, the contexts in which catechetical instruction took place were not altogether the same as when Luther first issued his catechisms. Times and circumstances had changed, along with educational needs and goals for religious instruction. Certainly the basic concern to educate children and laity about the faith remained, but by the late 16th century catechesis and its role and purpose in the teaching of the faith were seen in a slightly different light. The word "catechism" now referred almost exclusively to one or both of Luther's catechisms.[74] They had become standards for public teaching within the Lutheran churches. Beyond that official role "Luther's followers ascribed first to the traditional parts of the catechism, and then to Luther's own comment upon them, a central place in their own plans for ecclesiastical life".[75] In this way, by 1600, the Small Catechism had become almost canonized as *the* textual basis for all religious instruction in many Lutheran areas, including lands far beyond the borders of Germany.[76]

Although many Lutheran pastors and theologians wrote their own catechetical materials based on Luther's Small Catechism during the middle decades of the 16th century, by the 1570s and 1580s there was a general movement toward the use of Luther's Small Catechism itself in even more areas. Inter-Lutheran struggles had resulted in a strong concern for pure doctrine. Theologians emphasized the safe and secure foundation in Lutheran teaching established by Luther in his catechisms. Mary Jane Haemig observes, "For controversial purposes, it becomes, in the later period, important to learn the right catechism".[77] An addi-

---

[74] Haemig, "Living Voice," pp. 2–3.

[75] Kolb, "Layman's Bible," pp. 16–17.

[76] See, e.g., Jürgen Beyer, "Strategien zur Hebung der Frömmigkeit in Est- und Livland (1621–1710). Konfessionalisierung und Pietismus," in *Confessionalism and Pietism. Religious Reform in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Fred van Lieburg (Mainz, 2006), pp. 114–21.

[77] See Haemig, "Living Voice," pp. 111–12. Haemig offers several examples of catechetical preachers who admonished their hearers to use only Luther's catechism.

tional reason for the return to the use of Luther's catechism may be attributed to the increasingly popular notion that the Small Catechism was the Bible for the laity, as well as the inclusion of both the Large and Small Catechisms of Luther in the Book of Concord (1580). Luther's catechisms now became official confessional documents of the Lutheran churches, thus adding to their authority and prestige.

Instruction in churches

Although the precise details vary by region or locality, some fundamental consistencies in usage of the Small Catechism as a doctrinal standard and the foundational tool for instruction among many Lutherans are apparent by the early 17th century. It was a central feature of the daily life in churches and homes as well as an important element in worship as catechetical sermons and the public reading of the catechism became a regular part of certain services. In addition to pastors and teachers, *Kirchenordnungen* often required others to know the catechism, e.g., deacons, sextons, acolytes, as well as midwives. Catechetical instruction, almost always obligatory, took place in congregations through sermons, reviews, and examinations, while schools were established specifically for the purpose of catechetical instruction. In some places every parishioner was examined annually on the catechism, perhaps in preparation for visitations of the congregations.[78] Some orders required baptismal sponsors to demonstrate knowledge of the catechism, and the same was often expected of couples prior to marriage. These latter requirements were intended to insure better that children would be trained up in true faith.

Memorization of the catechism and a sound understanding of it, demonstrated through testing, normally constituted the essence of instruction before confirmation. Successful examinations were required for the rite of confirmation in those areas where it was practiced.[79] An evangelical form of confirmation had not been established in the early Reformation era though public catechetical instruction and examination were occurring in many areas at an early date, as evidenced, at the very least, by Luther's sermons on the catechism of 1528[80] and

[78] See Kolb, "Layman's Bible," p. 19, and Reu, *Luther's Small Catechism*, pp. 162–67.
[79] See Kolb, "Layman's Bible," p. 19.
[80] WA 30,1:57–122; LW 51:133–93.

Melanchthon's statement in Apology 15,41, that "among us, pastors and ministers of the church are required to instruct and examine the youth publicly…," apparently without confirmation. Luther wished to connect a rite of confirmation with Baptism, and in particular, with preparation for reception of the Lord's Supper. In 1538 Martin Bucer helped to draw up the Ziegenhain Order of Church Discipline to help the Lutheran churches in Hesse in dealing with disturbances caused by the Anabaptists. In the order, which was designed to direct the faith and life of congregations, a rite of confirmation was included that closely associated confirmation with admittance to the Lord's Supper. The 1540 *Kirchenordnung* for Brandenburg also included a ceremony for confirmation. Other church orders later followed the example and confirmation became more common. Nevertheless, many churches in the Lutheran regions rejected the practice of confirmation for a long time; its establishment varied and followed no regular pattern.[81]

Toward the end of the 16th century, pedagogical methods placed particular emphasis on the memorization of texts. Certainly, learning material by heart had always been an important element in schooling, but now the idea that rote memorization of a text constituted learning was becoming more common. Over time the acquisition of material by memory was given more importance than understanding its meaning. Some pastors and teachers stressed memorization of the catechism without necessarily emphasizing its comprehension. In his examination of *Kirchenordnungen* Otto Frenzel found little importance placed on thoughtless or forced memorization in the Reformation era. However, by the late 16th century this emphasis was growing; by the next century such references became commonplace.[82] Reu has suggested several reasons for this: the negligence and pride of pastors and instructors, coupled with a deteriorating understanding of the concept of faith—a belief that the knowledge of the truths of faith are synonymous with

[81] See Bjarne Hareide, *Die Konfirmation in der Reformationszeit: Eine Untersuchung der lutherischen Konfirmation in Deutschland 1520–85*, trans. Karin Kvideland (Göttingen, 1971); Wilhelm Diehl, *Zur Geschichte der Konfirmation* (Giessen, 1897); Arthur C. Repp, *Confirmation in the Lutheran Church* (St. Louis, 1964); Paul Turner, *The Meaning and Practice of Confirmation: Perspectives from a 16th-Century Controversy* (New York, 1987); and Wilhelm Maurer, "Geschichte von Firmung und Konfirmation bis zum Ausgang der lutherischen Orthodoxie," in *Confirmatio: Forschungen zur Geschichte und Praxis der Konfirmation*, ed. Kurt Frör (Munich, 1959), pp. 9–38.

[82] See Frenzel, *Zur Katechetischen Unterweisung im Zeitalter der Reformation und Orthodoxie* (Leipzig, 1915), pp. 31–36.

saving faith. Reu proposed that the most frequent reason for the greater emphasis on memorization was due to "an unreserved, though onesided, confidence in the efficacy of the Holy Ghost, who is bound to be operative in the human heart, if only the Word is imparted to it in some way".[83] Perhaps another reason was simply that pastors and teachers were convinced that if students methodically (and even mechanically) employed techniques of memorization, they would retain information permanently as well as come to a full understanding of it.

Instruction in homes

The catechism was central to the religious life of Lutheran homes in the late 16th century. As the Bible for the laity, the catechism provided people with an instrument to guide them in their understanding of the Christian faith and assist them in the carrying out of their Christian duties. In a fundamental way the catechism helped them to identify and defend against false doctrine, as well as to confess the true biblical teaching as presented there. Perhaps most importantly, the catechism was intended to aid to parents in the fulfillment of their responsibility of training up their children in the faith. Lutheran pastors and preachers sought to convince parents of the necessity to take seriously their vocations as bishops and pastors—as proclaimers of God's Word and teachers of the faith—in the home. The promises and assurances of the faith were intended for children as well as grownups. Children desperately needed what the catechism taught—the gospel message—as their very salvation depended on it. Although it is difficult to determine the extent to which catechetical instruction actually took place in Lutheran homes, it seems clear that at least pastors and preachers of the time expected parental teaching teaching of the catechism to be ongoing.

Instruction in schools

Parental teaching of the catechism was an extension of that broader program of religious teaching initiated in the churches. The same was the case for religious education in schools, which very often constituted a continuation of the teaching in the catechism. In many areas catechetical instruction in churches and schools was coordinated, often with

[83] Reu, *Luther's Small Catechism*, p. 174.

Kirchen- and *Schulordnungen* prescribing the same or related catechisms to provide consistent, uniform instruction, at least at the early stages. Of course, not all children went to schools, a fact which made churches and homes often the only places where children could receive formal religious training.

The curriculum in German-language schools in the late 16th and early 17th centuries was basic. Subjects of instruction for both boys and girls normally included, reading, writing, singing, and religion (usually in the form of catechetical teaching and examination). In some cases schoolchildren were required in addition to attend the *Kinderlehre* or catechism instruction in the church. Often the elaborations of Luther's catechism found a place in these German schools. They provided schoolteachers with guides for expounding those parts of the catechism that they were required to teach or wished to explain in greater depth.[84]

One example of the use of Luther's Small Catechism from the early 17th century is *Der Kleine Catechismus D. Martin Luthers (1616)* by Conrad Dieterich for use in both the churches and schools in Ulm. As the title page states, the catechism was intended for use by "young and simple people who desire to go to the Lord's Supper".[85] The book consists of the text Luther's Small Catechism in German, including questions and answers introducing and concluding the various parts of the catechism. Following this are prayers for children and for use in schools, as well as a catechetical hymn.

Compared to the German schools, the curriculum in the Latin schools during this time was much more advanced. It usually included instruction in the *trivium* (grammar, logic, and rhetoric) as well as music, history, arithmetic, natural science, Greek, Hebrew, and other subjects. Religious education was part of the core curriculum in these schools. Instruction could include the memorization of Bible passages and hymns and the learning of Bible stories as well as the reading of Sunday service gospel and epistle texts in Luther's German Bible, in Latin, or in the Greek New Testament. However, in most schools catechetical instruction remained at the center of all religious instruction in schools.

---

[84] Reu, *Luther's Small Catechism*, p. 168.

[85] "…für Junge und einfältige Leut/welche begehren zum Heyligen Abend-mal zugehen…," in *Der Kleine Catechismus D. Martin Luthers/beneben den Fragen deß Summarischen begriffs der sechs Hauptstucken Christlicher Lehr/&c.…* (Ulm, 1629).

In the 16th and 17th centuries Latin school catechisms and Latin expositions of the catechism normally served different purposes than their German counterparts. German catechisms and expositions had as their chief purpose to present the basics of Christian teaching to children and adults. Latin expositions served secondary school students above all. Like other subjects in the Latin school curriculum, the learning of the catechism progressed along a detailed course of instruction, often established in the *Schulordnung*. The youngest students normally studied and memorized Luther's Small Catechism in German, after which they learned it in Latin. This coupled language study and religion. Many schools used Latin catechetical texts that expanded on Luther's catechism, similar to the German elaborations. After mastery of these briefer catechisms, students took up more advanced works, with expanded expositions of the catechetical teaching. Finally, students often studied a catechism offering extensive instruction in Lutheran doctrine while still using the Small Catechism as a core text.

The Latin catechisms, written for students in Latin schools and academies, were intended to provide a more advanced instruction in the catechism and in theology. Through instruction in the catechism students were to receive a solid foundation upon which a greater structure of theological knowledge could be built. The Latin catechisms were designed not only to teach students the fundamental elements of the faith, but in turn to prepare them as skillful teachers of Christian doctrine to others, and to defend that doctrine against opponents. The Latin catechisms entailed a much broader discussion of the articles of the faith, as well as their correspondence and interconnection, and careful definition of terms and concepts. In addition, these catechisms often detail the objections of the opponents along with solutions and responses to them.

Other instructional literature

By providing new or improved materials for religious instruction, pastors and theologians hoped to educate, condition, and nourish people in the Christian faith, as well as give structure and discipline to the Christian life. In addition to catechetical teaching, efforts also focused on biblical literacy, worship, prayer, and Christian discipline. Illustrated biblical histories, booklets on the life and passion of Christ, as well as commentaries on the readings for the church year, provided a basic

knowledge of the Bible, especially to young people in schools.[86] Hymnbooks and prayerbooks, for instance, were beneficial for worship in congregations, but also in homes.[87] These manuals educated and cultivated the religious faith and lives of people in a practical manner.[88] Lay people used them for private or family devotions while ministers in the churches also employed them in teaching and the pastoral care of souls (*Seelsorge*).

Another instructional work used in the 17th and 18th centuries among Lutherans was the *Spruchbüchlein*, or a booklet of passages for learning and memorization. The *Spruchbüchlein* often gave the youngest children their first lessons from a textbook, teaching them the ABCs, Scriptural texts, selections from the catechism, and prayers.[89] The book was intended for use chiefly by parents and schoolteachers in the training of children in the Christian faith and devotion. Its purpose was to provide younger children with foundational religious instruction, and it was most likely used prior to advanced catechetical teaching and to the reading of the Bible itself. However, some writers of catechisms

[86] Lucas Lossius, for instance, published examples of each of these works: *Epitome Bibliorum Sacrorum Utriusque Testamenti, Continens Breviter insigniores ac maximè in illis memorabiles Narrationes, Historias, Loca, & Dicta Prophetica et Apostolica*… (Frankfurt/M, 1579); *Historia Passionis, Mortis, Sepulturae et Resurrectionis Jesu Christi Interrogationibus et Obiectionibus explicata: et Iconibus artificiose expressa*… (Frankfurt/M, 1551); and *Quaestiones Lucae Lossii in euangelia dominicalia et praecipuorum festorum Jesu Christi… ex praelectionibus et scriptis Philip. Melanthonis*… (Wittenberg, 1569). Johannes Spangenberg's *Postilla Teütsch*, German postils for teaching young people, was arranged in question-and-answer format: *Postilla Teütsch. Für die jungen Christen/Knaben vnd Meidlein/in Fragstuck verfasset.*… (Wittenberg, 1544). Luther wrote the foreword for this book. It was reprinted numerous times, appearing in more than 125 editions and also appeared in Latin, Low German, Dutch, Czech, and Slovenian.

[87] E.g., in 1543 Johannes Spangenberg published a hymnbook for use by young people in schools: *Alte vnd Newe Geistliche Lieder vnd Lobgesenge/von der Geburt Christi/vnsers Herrn/Für die Junge Christen* (Erfurt, 1544).

[88] On the intentions and uses for prayerbooks in the 16th and 17th centuries, see Cornelia Niekus Moore, *The Maiden's Mirror: Reading Material for German Girls in the 16th and 17th Centuries* (Wiesbaden, 1987), pp. 77–86; and idem, "Lutheran Prayer Books for Children as Usage Literature in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries" in *Gebetsliteratur der Frühen Neuzeit als Hausfrömmigkeit: Funktionen und Formen in Deutschland und den Niederlanden* (Wiesbaden, 2001), pp. 113–29.

[89] A popular example of this kind of book is found in Conrad Dieterich's *Biblisches Spruchbuechlein/darinn vnterschiedene vornehme Sprueche der Heil. Schrifft/zu Erbaw- vnd Fortpflantzung der Gottseligkeit bey der Schul Jugend zusammen getragen*… (Ulm, 1656), published for use in Ulm schools.

appended to their works a collection of biblical passages to supplement learning and combined them with catechetical instruction.[90]

The *Zuchtbüchlein* was a book of Christian discipline for young people and was also intended for use in homes and German schools.[91] The book contained verses prescribing how children should behave in various situations following the guidelines of Christian ethics and manners. In addition, the book provides children's prayers, some of them in rhyme, for a wide variety of occasions, along with prayers from the catechism and other educational and devotional material.

Dogmatic Expansions of Catechetical Teaching

In the period following the Reformation Lutherans continued the work of religious education while meeting the needs of their own time. While the Small Catechism remained the basis of religious instruction in many congregations and schools, the curricula in educational institutions, especially the Latin schools and *Gymnasia*, often involved more extensive instruction in the Christian faith than was offered in Luther's catechism. To fill this need, Lutheran pastors and teachers composed many expanded catechisms or compendia of Christian doctrine for students who had already mastered the basic catechetical teaching.

As catechetical instruction became more advanced in the schools and its content was developed and expanded, the catechisms used for instruction grew more dogmatic in nature. Lutheran pastors and theologians composed more detailed treatments of the basic teachings of Scripture, often adding them to the components of the catechism. This was in keeping with Luther's recommendation in the preface to the Small Catechism that instruction continue beyond his catechism to more advanced forms of catechetical teaching.[92] In some cases doctrinal textbooks designed for this purpose departed from the text

[90] An example of a catechism appended with a selection of biblical passages is Lucas Lossius' *Qvestivncvlae Methodicae de Christiano Catechismo in formam dialogi*… (Magdeburg, 1539). Here the passages are arranged according to the order of the church year. The appendix is entitled: "Praecipuae et Insigniores Sententiae, ex Euangelijs et Epistolis totius anni, tum dominicis, tum festis, in ususm puerorum delectae" and appears in some Wittenberg editions after 1545.

[91] Cf. e.g., Conrad Dieterich, *Christliches Zuchtbuechlein/Allerhand feiner Sitten und Tugenden/deren sich junge Leuth in Gottseligem Wesen und Geberden/bey sich selbst und gegen maenniglich befleißigen sollen*… (Ulm, 1674).

[92] Small Catechism, Preface, §17–18.

of the catechism itself and presented the basic Lutheran teachings in other formats. Others, however, expanded on the simple teaching of the Small Catechism, building on Luther's base and greatly supplementing its content. Some of these catechisms served as expositions or commentaries on Luther's catechism, but they also constructed a more detailed discussion of doctrinal topics far beyond what Luther had introduced, with the result that they were like small dogmatics handbooks. Of course, not all these instructional materials were based on Luther's catechisms. In many cases schools used textbooks for more advanced religious education not based on the core catechism texts at all, let alone on Luther's. This general movement toward the use of more complex and doctrinal catechisms in schools occurred in conjunction with the growing concern to equip children and laity to discern true and false teaching and to understand the doctrinal controversies in the period.[93]

The increasing detail and sophistication in the dogmatic discussions of the catechism can be seen in the development of the catechetical manual of David Chytraeus, professor of theology at Rostock, first at the *Pädagogium*, or academy, and later at the university. His Latin *Catechesis*, first published in 1554, arose out of his teaching at the academy; it was intended for use in Latin schools at the secondary level. Like Johann Spangenberg's *Margarita theologica*, it was to a large extent an epitome of Melanchthon's *Loci Communes*, which treated individual doctrinal topics in formal connection to his Preceptor's textbook rather than following the model of Luther's catechism.[94] The first edition from 1554 is a brief and elementary work, whereas the 1576 fourth edition is much larger—virtually a small dogmatics text. This work illustrates the gradual development of catechetical instruction during the 16th century.

A similar work was that of Polycarp Leyser, general superintendent and professor in Wittenberg, later court preacher in Dresden. He

---

[93] Hans-Jürgen Fraas, *Katechismustradition. Luthers kleiner Katechismus in Kirche und Schule* (Göttingen, 1971) notes that in the *Instructions to the Visitors of Parish Pastors in Electoral Saxony* (1528) schoolmasters are advised against discussing points of controversy or dissension when giving catechetial instruction. Fraas concludes that this exhortation was not followed in later times (Fraas, p. 72; see WA 26:239, 1; LW 40:318).

[94] Chytraeus, *Catechesis in Academia Rostochiana ex praelectionibus Dauidis Chytraei collecta* (Wittenberg, 1554). This work appeared in German as *Der Fürnehmbsten Heubtstück Christlicher Lehr Nützliche vnd kurtze erklerung* (Rostock, 1572), which became a catechism for the Lutheran estates of Lower and Upper Austria. It was reprinted at least three times (1575, 1578, 1587) and was part of the *Kirchenordnung* of the region.

based his expositions of public teaching on Luther's catechism with expanded doctrinal elaboration. Leyser's books included a bilingual amplification of the Small Catechism,[95] and an explanation of it in sermonic form.[96] Leyser's catechism contains Luther's text but augments it greatly, supplementing the individual parts with dogmatic treatments. The introduction of his catechism listed three purposes for the teaching of the catechism: first, that children and simple folk who are not able to grasp the entire Scriptures will be able to have its summary and fundamentals of the entire divine teaching in the catechism; then that young people have a guiding principle for their belief so they can recognize and distinguish true doctrine from that which is false; finally, that through the faithful witness of the ancients and learned scholars who teach in accordance with the catechism they may remain steadfastly faithful to true doctrine.[97]

When Lutherans in the later 16th century expanded on the text of the Small Catechism by taking up topics not treated by Luther, they often created a compendium of doctrine appropriate for use at the university level. Catechetical instruction moved to include a much broader understanding of what it was that the Christian needed to know. During the period of Lutheran Orthodoxy the catechism often served as a foundation upon which to build a framework for Lutheran theology and life.[98] Many Lutheran pastors and educators held the view that their parishioners and students needed to have a deeper, more detailed and comprehensive instruction, not only in the teachings of the core catechism texts (and Luther's explanations) but in the whole *corpus doctrinae* as derived from Holy Scripture. Luther had asserted that the catechism contained what every Christian should know. By the dawn of the 17th century, what Christians should know, especially students in Latin schools, was becoming more extensive.

Luther's catechism exposited the teachings of Scripture but did not treat specifically and individually each of the doctrines it discloses, nor

---

[95] *Catechismus Lutheri Latino-Germanico, Quaestionibus illustratus & ad praelum adornatus, in usum Illustrissimum Principium…* (Dresden, 1600).

[96] *Erklerung Deß Christlichen Catechismi/Herrn Doctoris Martini Lutheri/Jn Acht Predigten gefasset. Darinnen einfeltig geweiset wird/in welchen Stücken desselben die Caluinisten mit uns streitig sein…* (Leipzig, 1595).

[97] Leyser, *Catechismus Lutheri Latino-Germanico.* Cf. also Reu, *Quellen zur Geschichte*, 1,2,2:674.

[98] See Kolb, "Layman's Bible," p. 26.

did it treat all the subjects of Lutheran theology.[99] As a result, many Lutherans in the later Reformation period ventured to take up theological subjects and incorporate them into their elaborations on the catechism. They expanded their own discussion to fill in the "gaps" and provide a fuller and more detailed course of instruction. Because of the length and complexity of these new catechisms, to some extent they lost sight of the brevity and simplicity of Luther's catechism and made it more difficult for children.[100] Although Luther's text was almost always committed to memory and thoroughly learned in this time, the clear focus of Luther's words was often blurred by the elaborations and complexities of the dogmatic content that was inserted.[101] In many cases the later Lutheran teachers of catechesis had different purposes and goals than Luther.

What set the later period of catechetical teaching apart, particularly in schools, was this doctrinal emphasis and expansion of the instruction. At the end of the 16th century Lutheran teachers were approaching the task of catechetical instruction with methods that for the most part were a continuation of much earlier ones. The catechetical lessons were presented in question-and-answer format, and at the very least students learned by heart the text of Luther's catechism. As catechisms became textbooks for use in schools, especially higher-level Latin schools, they took on more of the character of a dogmatic textbook. Elements of rhetoric and logic began to shape the instruction of the catechism as well as the manner and methods with which it was taught in schools. Hans-Jürgen Fraas refers to this trend as the "*Akademisierung des Katechismus*" and notes that inclusion of theoretical language and the tendency toward the imparting of detailed information are marks of this "academization" of the catechism.[102] Catechetical books and sermons often

[99] As has been discussed, Luther did not intend his catechisms as textbooks of dogmatic theology. Rather he geared them for the daily Christian life. See Fraas, *Katechismustradition*, pp. 25–31; and Peters, *Kommentar*, 1:18–19.

[100] See Arand, *That I May Be*, pp. 17–18; Reu, *Luther's Small Catechism*, pp. 174–78.

[101] During the periods of Orthodoxy and Pietism, Lutherans continued to have a great appreciation for Luther's catechisms. Reu cites the example of Michael Walther, general superintendent of Celle, who in his *Gloria Catechismi* of 1645, listed ten excellent features of Luther's Small Catechism, including integrity and perfection, sincerity and clarity, simplicity and plainness, brevity and artistic conciseness, elegance and convenience, utility, and usefulness (Reu, *Luther's Small Catechism*, p. 173).

[102] See Fraas, *Katechismustradition*, p. 72. Fraas suggests that Melanchthon's *Catechesis puerilis* (1540) is an early example of an academic catechism.

became small dogmatic works, still founded upon the catechism, but with a much more detailed exposition of its doctrinal content.

In her examination of Lutheran catechetical sermons from the late 16th century, Haemig has noted several interpretations of the increased length and doctrinal complication of the sermons. One interpretation argues that this complex treatment of the catechetical material contradicted the purpose of preaching the catechism simply and understandably. Another view sees the expanded detail and greater complexity of the catechetical sermons as addressing the goal of providing the hearers with more information but at the same time undermining the goal of simplicity. Yet another interpretation maintains that "these sermons actually prove that Luther's program (advancing from simple content to more difficult) was being followed and that people were in fact advancing to a deeper knowledge of the subject matter".[103] The increased length and dogmatic complexity of preaching and teaching can be seen as indications that Luther's program was being pursued, Haemig notes. Preachers could take it for granted that their hearers knew the Small Catechism, at least on an elementary level. With such knowledge preachers proceeded to more complicated explanations of the catechism in order to advance the hearers' understanding of the catechetical content. The preachers also exercised much freedom in treating the contents of the catechism.[104] Haemig finds that catechetical preachers added discussion of doctrinal topics that were not included in Luther's catechism and responded to issues of the day. They preached sermons of varying form and length, made use of illustrations and hymns, all which "indicate that method could change to fit a preacher's purposes".[105]

This deeper delving into biblical teaching, following Luther's program for advancing from simple content to more difficult, is especially evident in works designed for use in Latin schools, where, after a few years of training, students were expected to have a fairly high level of knowledge concerning the catechism and its doctrinal content. Without

---

[103] Haemig, "Living Voice," p. 127.

[104] Ibid., pp. 127–29. Haemig points out that these attempts by preachers to expand freely on the treatment of the catechism as they saw fit contradicts the arguments of Gerald Strauss, who asserted that catechists from the period employed a "rigid methodology" which was "text-bound" and "wedded to a pedantic dependence on rote memorization and endless reiteration". See Strauss, *Luther's House of Learning: Indoctrination of the Young in the German Reformation* (Baltimore, 1978), p. 224.

[105] Haemig, "Living Voice," p. 130.

question, the influence of humanistic methods was an important factor in the doctrinal emphasis.

Textbooks for religious instruction

There are numerous examples of catechetical texts from the late 16th and early 17th centuries that were dogmatic in nature and focus. These works, often in Latin, were intended for students in schools who already had a solid foundation in the catechism. One of the earliest works based on Luther's catechism with a dogmatic emphasis is that of Lucas Lossius. Lossius studied at Wittenberg with Luther and Melanchthon and became rector at Lüneburg in 1533. His catechism, the *Qvaestivncvlae Methodicae de Christiano Catechismo*, first published in Lüneburg in 1539. was intended for the more advanced students in Latin schools.[106] According to Reu, Lossius learned method from Melanchthon in the lecture halls at Wittenberg and, following Melanchthon's aims, introduced dogmatic terminology into catechetical instruction.[107] In the 1550 edition of his catechism Lossius also introduced *obiectiones*, or opposing arguments, into the instruction, to teach students to think theologically about solutions to these arguments and to prepare them "to respond to the calumnies of the papists and others".[108]

German catechisms also elaborated the teaching of the catechism though not always with overly detailed dogmatic content. For example, Justus Gesenius, pastor in Braunschweig and later court and cathedral preacher in Hildesheim, wrote several German catechisms, all of which were based upon Luther's Small Catechism and widely used in the northern principalities. His *Kleine Katechismus-Schule* (1631)[109]

[106] Lossius, *Qvestivncvlae Methodicae*. See Reu, Quellen zur Geschichte, 1,3,2,2:662–64; 686–718; 837–46; and II:490–510.

[107] Reu also maintains that those who followed Melanchthon inserted dogmatic material into Latin catechetical instruction: "While the Latin catechetical writings, especially those influenced by Melanchthon, dragged into the instruction of the young too much material of dogmatical nature, the German explanations and treatises were more free from such unchildlike additions" (*Luther's Small Catechism*, pp. 63–64). Fraas holds a position similar to that of Reu. Fraas credits Melanchthon with being the primary influence behind the theological extension of the Small Catechism (*Katechismustradition*, pp. 72, 75–83).

[108] "Calumnias Papistarum & aliorum respondere". See Lossius' text in Reu, *Quellen zur Geschichte*, 1,3,2,2:718–31.

[109] *Kleine Catechismus-Schule. Das ist: Kurtzer Unterricht/wie die Catechismus-Lehre bey der Jugend und den Einfältigen zu treiben* (Lüneburg, 1635).

and its epitome, the *Außzug der kleinen Catechismus Schule* (1635),[110] were both designed for instruction in homes and were adaptable for use by children of different learning levels. Perhaps Gesenius's most popular catechism, the *Kleine Catechismusfragen über den kleinen Catechismum Lutheri* (first published 1639), was an epitome adapted from his previous catechisms intended for use in schools and churches.[111]

In his prefatory letter to the reader Gesenius explains that the *Kleine Catechismus-Schule* is designed for use by the "*Hausvatter*" for catechetical instruction in the home during the week, so that he may be a "*Catechismus-Prediger*" in his own home. Gesenius divides his catechetical teaching into three parts: the first for "the very simple and beginners" (*die gantz Einfältig und Anfangenden*) consisting of brief questions and answers on the parts of the catechism. Here the text in larger font is for beginners and is to be learned first. Thereafter, lectures exposit the teaching for the parent or instructor to read, followed by Luther's own explanation from the Small Catechism, concluding with a hymn verse to be sung based on the section of the catechism. The second part of the *Catechismus-Schule* offers more advanced catechetical instruction for those who have completed the first part. These questions are a little more difficult and the answers longer. More background information on the different parts of the catechism is provided, and there are also longer sections for the instructor to read. The third part of the catechism is a collection of Scripture passages for the entire catechism arranged under titles. Gesenius offered questions dealing with various parts of the catechism and corresponding answers with passages from the Bible.

Gesenius did not introduce much technical dogmatic material into his catechetical instruction but rather maintained a simple approach. His goal was to have his learners live out the catechism and its teaching in their daily lives. In contrast to others writing catechetical works from the time, Gesenius focused on the life of the believer in practice more than on the details of orthodox doctrine. A basic knowledge of a person's salvation is important, yet this salvation must be acted upon and lived out in the Christian life. Gesenius used the Small Catechism to emphasize the life of holiness and obedience to God that Christians

[110] *Außzug der kleinen Catechismus Schule… Darin die blossen Fragen vnd Antwort zusammen gezogen sind/für die jenigen/so sich im Catechismo vnterweisen lassen* (Lüneburg, 1635).

[111] *Kleine Catechismus-Fragen/Uber den kleinen Catechismum Lutheri* (Lüneburg, 1653).

are to lead. Christian life should be evidenced and in accord with the teaching of the Christian faith.

While some catechisms might discuss theological controversies incidentally, others were intended specifically to help in the refutation of false doctrine. These so-called "Kontroverskatechismen" were designed to instruct and support orthodox teaching. For instance, some catechisms were intended for Lutheran congregations in non-Lutheran areas, or which had Roman Catholic, Reformed, or other groups (sects) living among or near them. In these cases the Lutherans often were under duress to defend their teaching or desired to turn others from their error. In these areas there was often the perceived need to uncover the basis of the false teaching and clear the path for true doctrine. The catechism of Johann Schröder is such an example, presenting a detailed course in Lutheran dogma and emphasizing the discernment of true and false teaching. Schröder was pastor at Lauterbach in Hesse, later superintendent in Schweinfurt, and finally chief pastor in Nuremberg. His *Nutzlicher und inn Gottes Wort Wolgegründter Unterricht* (1602) was based on Luther's catechism and intended for Lutherans in the Roman Catholic cities Cologne and Aachen.[112] Schröder reworked the German into a Latin version titled *Catechetica, seu, Christianae Doctrinae Erotemata* (1606) for use in the *Gymnasium* in Schweinfurt.[113] Schröder's work was designed to provide explain basic doctrine to readers and equip them to defend these against unbiblical teaching. There were not many catechisms like Schröder's, designed for the specialized purposes of refuting false teaching in this way. Nevertheless, with this step Luther's catechism was formally assigned a significant role in controversial theology.[114]

---

[112] *Nutzlicher und inn Gottes Wort Wolgegründter Unterricht/wie die zarte angehende Jugend in der Christlichen heilsamen Lehr des Catechismi nicht allein Fruchtbarlich zunehmen/besondern auch in denen jtziger Zeit in Streit gezogenen Religions Articuln wider allerhand verführunge/auß Gottes Wort/mit gutem bestendigem grund der Warheit/sich wol verwahren/befestigen und vertheidigen könne*… (Frankfurt am Main, 1602).

[113] *Catechetica, seu, Christianae Doctrinae Erotemata, e Variis Seculi Huius Controversiis Petita, & ad capita Catecheseos Minoris, quam vocant, accommodata*… (Schweinfurt, 1606).

[114] Ferdinand Cohrs refers to Schröder's catechism as a "Streit-Katechismus" or controversy catechism, *Vierhundert Jahre Luthers Kleiner Katechismus. Kurze Geschichte seiner Entstehung und seines Gebrauchs* (Langensalza, 1929), p. 38. Following Cohrs, Fraas argues that Schröder's catechism represents the beginning of the use of the Small Catechism in *Kontroverstheologie*. He notes some of the *Kontroverskatechismen* that followed (*Katechismustradition*, pp. 97–102). On controversial theological material in catechetical sermons from the late 16th century, see Haemig, "Living Voice," pp. 108–111, 266–69, 271–72, 279–80.

The handbook of Wittenberg theology professor Leonhard Hütter (1563–1616) was one of the most important Lutheran theological works of the 17th century. The *Compendium locorum theologicorum*, first published in 1610, was more a dogmatic textbook than a catechism, yet it was intended for secondary students and adults alike.[115] Not all Latin schools of the period used works expanding on the catechism as the basis of their religious instruction for more advanced students. Following the example of Melanchthon, Hütter employed the *loci* method in his instruction, yet set the material in the form of questions and answers. He occasionally cited or referred to Luther's catechisms; however, he based his material more frequently on Scripture and the Lutheran Confessions. Although addressing theological controversies and refuting false teaching, his approach is not overly polemic. In the course of treating thirty-four theological loci, Hütter's handbook presents a comprehensive, yet easily-grasped outline of Lutheran doctrine. In a sense his *Compendium* is a mini-dogmatics text that pointed ahead to the curriculum students would find at the university level.

The catechetical teaching of Conrad Dieterich

The approach to instructing the Christian faith and life by means of the catechism reached its point of greatest development in the pedagogical and catechetical method of Conrad Dieterich. Dieterich was director of the *Paedagogium* (university preparatory school) and professor of practical philosophy at the University of Giessen, before serving as superintendent and *Münsterprediger* in Ulm. He is best known for several catechetical writings, all of which were based on Luther's Small Catechism. His *Institutiones catecheticae* (1613) was perhaps the most widely used Lutheran catechetical textbook in Latin schools during the 17th century.[116] For younger students Dieterich also wrote the *Epitome Catechetica* (1614), a compendium of the *Institutiones* also intended for Latin schools.[117] Soon after the publication of these works in Latin, they were translated into German for lay adults as well as for instruction

---

[115] *Compendium Locorum Theologicorum, Ex Scripturis sacris, & libro Concordiae…* (Wittenberg, 1610). A German translation was published in 1612.

[116] *Institutiones Catecheticae, è B. Lutheri Catechesi Depromptæ, variisque notis Logicis & Theologicis…* (Giessen, 1613).

[117] *Epitome praeceptorum catecheticorum in usum classicorum inferiorum, ex institutionibus catecheticis collecta* (Giessen, 1614).

in schools and churches. Dieterich also prepared *Der Kleine Catechismus D. Martin Luthers* (1616), a German catechism based on Luther's Small Catechism for use in the churches and schools in Ulm.[118] As educator and theologian, Dieterich brought the message and instruction of the Small Catechism to new generations of Lutherans and at the same time interpreted the catechism anew.[119]

Throughout his work Dieterich emphasized the catechism's role in the education of children. His *Catechismus Predigt* (1626) stressed the role of parents in ensuring that their children receive catechetical instruction:

> [Instruction in the faith] is necessary for the sake of the salvation [of children], since by nature we are all children of unbelief (Eph 2:3). The natural person perceives nothing of the Spirit of God—it is foolishness to him and he cannot recognize it (1 Cor 2:14). Our understanding is obscured… we flee from the knowledge and fear of God, we do not strive for faith and salvation, but rather we must be instructed in them and thus be educated. When you have a child and let him grow up without discipline or education, you do not teach him to pray, do not send him to school, to church and catechetical instruction, with the result that he does not learn his catechism and other necessary elements of salvation, how will he know God? how will he believe? how will he be saved?… If you wish your child to be saved, then [the child] must be instructed in the knowledge of God, of faith and salvation.[120]

---

[118] Cf. footnote 85.

[119] Similar to Dieterich in this regard is Salomo Glassius, general superintendent of the churches in Gotha and director of the *Gymnasium* there. His *Kurtzer Begriff* (1642) was a brief explanation of Luther's Small Catechism intended for school students, but also adults: *Kurtzer Begriff der Christlichen Lehr: Aus dem Catechismo Lutheri gezogen/Vor die Erwachsenen/wie auch Kinder in Schulen/so beyderseits die Wort des Catechismi können*… (Gotha, 1642).

[120] Dieterich, "Catechismus Predigt [1626]," p. 115: "Ist nötig… umb ihrer Seligkeit willen/dann von Natur sind wir alle Kinder des Unglaubens/Ephes. 2,3. Der natürliche Mensch vernimpt nichts vom Geist Gottes/es ist ihm eine Thorheit/und kan es nicht erkennen/1. Corinth. 2,14. Unser Verstand ist verfinstert/… fleucht uns also Erkäntniß und Furcht Gottes/der Glaub und Seligkeit nicht an/sondern wir müssen darin unterwiesen/und dazu aufferzogen werden. Wann du nun dein Kind hingehen/und in seinem Soot auffwachsen lessest/lehrest es nicht beten/schickest es nicht zur Schulen/zur Kirchen und KinderLehr/daß es darin sein Catechismum und andere nothwendige Stück der Seligkeit lerne/wie wil es Gott erkennen? wie wil es gläuben? wie wil es selig werden?… Wiltu demnach daß dein Kind selig werde/sihe/so muß es in erkäntniß Gottes/des Glaubens und Seligkeit unterwiesen werden".

Once again, Dieterich asserted, even more important within the family is that parents make sure their children are brought up in the fear of God and in his teaching:

> How will [parents], when God blesses them with children, educate them in the fear of the Lord and teach them to pray, [how will they teach] little Nicholas [when] they themselves are not able to pray, and know nothing of the fear of God and of his teaching? For this reason the instruction and knowledge of the catechism and of the articles of faith is the most necessary thing in this world.[121]

There is both an ominous and joyous side to teaching catechism. On one hand, catechetical instruction is an obligation to be carried out by parents at the risk of jeopardizing their children's temporal and eternal lives. Yet, Dieterich also asserts that training up children in the Christian faith is a praiseworthy and honorable task of parents:

> Tell me, then, Christian *Haußvater* and Christian *Haußmutter*, tell me what kind of splendid ornament for home and church do you have, when your little children stand around the table in your home like young olive branches, saying their prayers to their heavenly Father with folded hands and Christian humility? when they stand in school, in church, and in catechetical instruction, like tender little church seedlings, reciting their faith-statements from the catechism and their fine Bible passages? I know of no greater honor, glory, or praise that fathers and mothers can have because of their children than this, and indeed should fill their eyes with tears of joy.[122]

As professor and pastor, Dieterich operated within contexts distinctly Lutheran, both in church and school. His catechetical work reflects the teachings of Lutheran theology, particularly the nuanced doctrine and practice of the churches and schools in Hesse-Darmstadt and Ulm. In

---

[121] Ibid., p. 116: Wie wollen sie/wann ihnen Kinder von Gott bescheret/dieselbige in des Herrn Furcht erziehen sie beten lehren/do Nicholas sie selbst nicht beten können/ nichts von Gottesfurcht und Lehr wissen? Darumb ist die Unterweisung und Wisschafft des Catechismi und der Glaubens Articuli das allernötigste Stück auff dieser Welt.

[122] Ibid., p. 117: Dann/sage mir/Christlicheer Haußvater/Christlicher Haußmutter/ sage mir/was hastu für ein herrliche Hauß- und Kirchen Zierd/wann deine Kindlein in deinem Hauß wie die Oelzweiglein umb deinen Tisch stehen/mit gefaltenen Händen und Christlicher Demuth ihr Gebet zu ihrem Vater im Himmel verrichten? Wann sie in den Schulen/in der Kirchen und KinderLehr/wie die zarte Kirchenpflänzlein stehen ihres Glaubens-Red und Antwort/aus ihrem Catechismo geben/ihre schöne herrliche Biblische Sprüche recitiren können? Ich weiß kein grösser Ihr/Ruhm noch Lob/die Väter und Mütter an ihren jungen Kindern haben können als eben diß/daruber einem wol für Frewden die Augen ubergehen solten…

these, like other Lutheran regions, preaching, teaching, and catechizing were all important to the inculcation of the Christian faith and the improvement of religious knowledge. Through these means Dieterich and other preachers and teachers sought to instruct children and lay people on how to live in Christian discipline and devotion.

The Lutheran tradition had underscored the importance of Christian education at home, in schools, and in churches. In Dieterich's day religious instruction for the laity normally focused on three areas: first, the reading of the Bible in German, preaching on biblical texts, and memorization of passages; second, the catechism taught at home, school, and in churches (including catechetical services in which selections from the catechism were read aloud and preached upon); and finally, in the singing of hymns at home, in schools, and churches. Instruction using these means had been a Lutheran emphasis since the beginning of the Reformation, and Dieterich continued to use them as core components of Christian education. Yet he put his own stamp on his catechetical works to serve his unique intentions, expectations, and programs of instruction.

Dieterich considered his teaching to be in the long catechetical tradition of the Christian church going back to the ancients.[123] Within that rich heritage Dieterich squarely based his work on that of Luther and his catechism. Dieterich, too, understood the catechism and its message of salvation to be primary in the teaching of the Christian faith as well as in preserving this faith throughout a believer's life. The catechism, or catechetical instruction, was the Μικροβιβλια, or micro-Bible, and a devotional book for the laity.[124] Dieterich also saw himself in line with his predecessors—writers of Lutheran catechisms—such as Johannes Brenz, David Chytraeus, Lucas Lossius, Aegidius Hunnius, and others.[125] It is clear from his adaptation and republication of Luther's Small Catechism in Ulm that Dieterich believed he was faithfully continuing the work begun by Luther himself nearly a century before. Likewise, he may have viewed his *Institutiones Catecheticae* and *Epitome Catechetica* as answers to Luther's call for a longer catechism to impart students with a richer and fuller understanding. Dieterich realized the need for

---

[123] Cf. Dieterich, *Institutiones Catecheticae (1613)*, "Epistola Dedicatoria," fol. 3.

[124] Cf. Dieterich, *EPITOME CATECHETICORUM PRAECEPTORUM. In usum CLASSIVM INFERIORUM, COLlecta ex Institutionibus Catecheticis*… (Ulm, 1630), "Dedicatio," fol. A2.

[125] Cf. Dieterich, *Institutiones Catecheticae (1613)*, "Epistola Dedicatoria," fols. 3–4.

adapting the message of the catechism to his various audiences. That could mean expanding it, further developing its content into a much fuller instruction in Christian teaching. Within the Lutheran tradition Dieterich applied a specialized yet faithful approach to teaching the catechism. Knowing his intended audience, he sought to impart Luther's message with fidelity to the evangelical tradition, but in a manner that he believed appropriate and practical for their situation.

The way Dieterich defines catechesis in his two school catechisms provides a key to understanding his purpose in composing them. In the *Institutiones Catecheticae* Dieterich defines catechesis as follows:

> [Catechesis is] the concise and clear instruction of the untrained in the foundation of the Christian religion, faith, and life, gathered from the prophetic and apostolic scriptures. (*Or*, it is a compendium of prophetic and apostolic doctrine which is taught orally to the uninstructed and which from them [a repetition of the material] is demanded in return…).[126]

On one hand, Dieterich's definition introduces nothing novel or revolutionary into the practice or theology of catechetical instruction. As with most catechetical teaching of the period, Dieterich understood catechesis as involving the combined use of printed materials with oral instruction and repetition, and, consistent with the Lutheran understanding, he underscored strongly that the catechetical teaching is based on Scripture. However, what is significant is what lies behind the phrase "instruction in the foundation". Dieterich's foundation of doctrine in the *Institutiones Catecheticae* and *Epitome Catechetica* is much more detailed and comprehensive than Luther's in the Small Catechism. Dieterich hardly intended to push aside Luther's catechism. On the contrary, he sought to explain and expound upon it, that through his commentary on the text he might lead his students to a fuller understanding of the catechism's content and teaching. Dieterich did not necessarily reject the simplicity of Luther's language or its treatment of Christian doctrine. Rather, he made the Small Catechism part of his own work, placing it at the center of his instruction. Yet, in the end, Dieterich's answer to Luther's question "Was ist das?" [What is that?] encompasses much more than Luther's own answer.

---

[126] "*Quid est Catechesis?* Est brevis ac perspicua rudiorum in fundamento religionis, fidei, & vitae christianae e scriptis Propheticis ac Apostolicis collecta institutio. [*Seu* Est compendium doctrinae Propheticæ & Apostolicæ quod rudioribus viva voce traditur & ab iisdem rursus exigitur…]". *Institutiones Catecheticae* (1613), p. 1.

In his own catechetical works Dieterich employed Luther's Small Catechism as a core theological text—a foundation—upon which to build a fuller structure of Lutheran theology. The result, particularly in the *Institutiones Catecheticae* and the *Epitome Catechetica*, is that Dieterich not only explained the theology of the Small Catechism but expanded upon it, often in great detail, almost as if providing a running theological commentary on the text. Both of these works are largely dogmatic in direction and focus and were specifically intended to serve as textbooks for more advanced students. The *Institutiones Catecheticae* works out the catechism to the point where it serves as a compendium or handbook of Lutheran dogmatics suitable for study at the *Gymnasium* or perhaps even university level.

Particularly in the *Institutiones Catecheticae*, and to a lesser extent in the *Epitome Catechetica*, Dieterich utilized a detailed method in expounding Luther's catechism and expanding upon it. He did not follow a topical or *loci* arrangement of doctrines. Rather Luther's catechism largely determines the arrangement of the doctrinal content, serving as the foundation upon which Dieterich builds a framework. He designed a method for instruction and pegged his material to the particular circumstances of the broader curriculum of the *Gymnasium*. The pattern consisted of three steps: First, after citing the particular sections of Luther's catechism, Dieterich set down "principal definitions and questions".[127] Second, these were explained "logically" and placed in smaller font and in parentheses for ready identification.[128] Finally, these were "illustrated with various things selected from theological axioms, likewise with principal objections and responses, sometimes interspersed, though more infrequently, with embellishments of certain Fathers".[129] Dieterich expressed his concern that too many younger students become overwhelmed by the "objection and response" approach. But his aim was that over time as they continued, the elder students would be "carried up to the higher exercises" so that, in addition to the fundamentals of the Lutheran faith, "they may learn the logic and in one and the

[127] "præcipuas definitiones & quæstiones," Dieterich, "Epistola Dedicatoria," *Institutiones Catecheticae* (1613), fol. 4a.

[128] "Logicè," ibid., fol. 4a.

[129] "variis… desumptis axiomatibus Theologicis, objectionibus & responsionibus praecipuis, interspersis nonnunquam, quanquam rariùs, Patrum quorundum floribus, illustrare voluimus," ibid., fol. 4a.

same work, at the same time, the foundation of principal arguments".[130] Dieterich proposed that these older students "learn effective solutions of theological objections" in the process, concluding with the statement: "This is our aim, this is the plan of our subject".[131] In these three steps Dieterich followed a learning model that closely attends to the language, logical thinking, and practical application and communication of the teachings of the catechism. Where Luther's catechism did not specifically address a theological topic, Dieterich provided a treatment of it to fill out the broader discussion. In the *Institutiones Catecheticae* and the *Epitome Catechetica* Dieterich occasionally took up individual doctrines in separate sections adjoining the parts of the catechism. For example, he appended expositions on sin, repentance, and good works at the conclusion of his discussion of the Decalog.

Dieterich clearly saw logical analysis as an important element—even an instrument—for learning the catechism, at least for his intended audience in his Latin catechisms. The logical parsing—the application of the study of formal logic—served primarily as a pedagogical tool, but it also has the secondary effect of systematizing in a particular way the catechetical teaching and its dogmatic content. Dieterich's use of logic to analyze and explain the teaching of Luther's catechism apparently presupposes two things. First, catechetical theology can be explained and analyzed according to dialectical method.[132] Moreover, Dieterich

---

[130] "superiores verò ad altiora exercitia evecti… una eademque opere logicam simul præcipuorum argumentorum sedem perciperent," ibid.

[131] "objectionum Theologicarum solutiones quasi aliud agentes addiscerent… Hic finis noster est, hoc propositi nostri consilium," ibid., fols. 4–5.

[132] In Dieterich's day many Lutheran theologians considered it necessary for philosophy to play a role in the practice of theology. Despite the rejection of metaphysics at Wittenberg early in the first decade of the Reformation, Aristotle's corpus was never completely discarded there. Even in 1518 Melanchthon was planning a "purified Aristotle" and began lectures on his Ethics in 1527/1528. The Wittenberg theologians considered elements of Aristotle necessary for the work of theology; see Theodor Dieter, *Der junge Luther und Aristoteles* (Berlin, de Gruyter, 2001). Melanchthon's *Loci Communes* had arranged Lutheran doctrine into an integrated and methodical framework using rhetorical and dialectical tools. See Robert Kolb, "The Advance of Dialectic in Lutheran Theology: The Role of Johannes Wigand (1523–1587)," in *Regnum, Religio et Ratio Essays Presented to Robert M. Kingdon*, ed. Jerome Friedman (Kirksville, 1987), pp. 93–102; idem, "The Ordering of the *Loci Communes Theologici*: The Structuring of the Melanchthonian Dogmatic Tradition," *Concordia Journal* 23 (1997), 317–37; Sachiko Kusukawa, "*Vinculum Concordiae*: Lutheran Method by Philip Melanchthon," in *Method and Order in Renaissance Philosophy of Nature: The Aristotle Commentary Tradition*, eds. Daniel A. DiLiscia, Eckhard Kessler, Charlotte Methuen (Aldershot, 1997), pp. 337–54; John R. Schneider, "Melanchthon's Rhetoric As a Context for Understanding His Theology,"

seemed to assume that catechetical teaching is able to illustrate and instruct the fundamentals of dialectic. He sought to teach his students dialectical method as a secondary goal in the course of catechetical instruction and believed the material of the catechism to be serviceable for the task.

Like many other theologians during the period of Lutheran Orthodoxy, Dieterich grappled with the most pressing doctrinal issues of his time. The content and orientation of his catechetical writings occasionally reflect the controversies and theological issues of the day, as Dieterich sought to prepare and equip his students for dealing with the various doctrinal conflicts they would encounter in their lives. Dieterich gave the proper exposition of doctrine careful attention in his catechisms as he prompts students to articulate Lutheran teachings in complex detail. Still, Dieterich's approach does not represent an example of the intellectualizing of religion. More than merely correct doctrinal explication, his purpose was always evangelical and pastoral as well as catechetical. Dieterich was invariably pastoral in his concern for the intellectual and spiritual education of readers and students in the message of the gospel. He did not set absorbing theological exposition for its own sake as his goal; he aimed to train young people in a practical, living faith engaged with other Lutherans and non-Lutherans alike.

A few additional observations may be made regarding the trend toward an increasingly complex program of catechetical instruction by the beginning of the seventeenth century. First, pedagogical guidelines of the time called for a precise and thorough treatment of a subject according to ordered methods of instruction—methods often that included core elements of rhetoric and logic. These methods varied, and there was disagreement about how best to communicate the information of instruction as well as how to learn it and make use of it in everyday life. Second, it must be admitted that the theological-anthropological orientation of catechetical instruction—focusing on the proclamation of God's Word of salvation to human beings and intended to nurture Christian faith and life—was sometimes replaced by a pedagogical approach. This latter approach was primarily aimed at the impartation of doctrine and the development of knowledge using specific didactic methods. The result of these trends was, in many cases, that Luther's

---

in *Melanchthon in Europe: His Work and Influence beyond Wittenberg*, ed. Karin Maag (Grand Rapids, 1999), pp. 141–59.

Small Catechism was considered the framework for communicating the teachings of Scripture. Put another way, the Small Catechism was the foundation upon which a doctrinal theology was based and which communicated the teachings of the Bible. For some, the Bible came to be understood as a collection of doctrines to be taught, understood, and believed, and the catechism was the system for instructing these doctrines.

Otto Frenzel viewed this development as a change of course toward exclusive doctrinairism in the church's catechetical instruction and as a separation of theology and religion. He argued that the essential religious and ethical goal of teaching gave way to scholastic abstraction in catechesis.[133] Reu also saw this move as a turning point in the history of religious instruction, maintaining that the dogmatic element, especially under Melanchthon's influence, came too much into the foreground, and has taken place ever since, diminishing the pulse beat of the religious life.[134] In his *Katechismustradition* Fraas to a large extent follows the theories taken up by Frenzel and Reu.

Much can be learned from the context in which writers of Lutheran catechisms worked in the late Reformation and period of orthodoxy. The methods they used to communicate the teaching of the Christian faith were an integral part of their understanding of education and its goals at the time. The approach of later Lutherans to catechetical instruction and its application did not necessarily lead to the obfuscation or loss of Luther's message, nor did they ultimately diminish its important role in the education of children and lay adults. Robert Kolb has pointed out the oversimplification that permeates "the theory of the decline and fall of Lutheran catechetical instruction" as suggested by Fraas and others. He contends that instead of seeing a decay or decline in this period, "we must keep in mind that catechists of the late 16th century fought the same battle that all catechists fight as they try to find the balance between learning the material and understanding and applying it". Kolb also calls attention to the pedagogical methods of the age and to the use of the catechism as a textbook in schools. He asserts that "our evaluation of seventeenth-century catechetics must be based on a much broader and deeper look at the ways in which the Christian faith was taught than Fraas takes…" Noting the importance

[133] Frenzel, *Katechetischen Unterweisung*, p. 39.
[134] Reu, *Quellen zur Geschichte*, 1,2:176.

of recalling the condition and needs of churches and schools at the time, Kolb adds: "That the catechism took on a textbook quality when it was employed as a textbook may be regrettable, but it reflects the practice which church and society found necessary for instruction in the faith".[135] The methods later Lutherans applied in their work gave shape and direction to their catechetical teaching. They added to the message of Luther's catechism, commenting and elaborating on its simple content, and in the end some of them, like Dieterich, produced a dogmatic interpretation and exposition of the catechism that Luther scarcely would have recognized.

Conclusion

Education in the Christian faith and life was of the greatest importance to Luther. He focused this education on the teachings of the Bible, offering his Small Catechism as a summary and exposition of that biblical teaching intended for all Christians. Luther believed that God through his Word is at work in the training up of people in the faith—that he creates and sustains this faith and gives salvation and rebirth. Through this teaching God's children are also equipped for every good work of faith. The followers of Luther continued to proclaim his evangelical message and inherited his earnestness, if not his zeal, in communicating it. They took up Luther's Small Catechism and its teaching and brought it to new people and places, believing that the catechism's message was meant for all contexts. These heirs of Luther prized the catechism and made it their own. They took possession of its words, ideas, and forms, and appropriated them for use in their own time and for their own instructional purposes and goals. They claimed Luther's catechism without obliterating the memory of Luther, sharing and handing down his evangelical theology through their own interpretations of the catechism. They were the descendants of the Lutheran catechetical tradition and, for later generations, they became its ancestors.

[135] Kolb, *Luther as Prophet*, p. 162, n. 21.

DEVOTIONAL LIFE IN HYMNS, LITURGY, MUSIC, AND PRAYER

Christopher Boyd Brown

In 1529 the Wittenberg presses issued under Luther's name three closely related volumes in small octavo format: his Small Catechism, revised and gathered into book form after its initial broadsheet printing; a prayerbook, the new and expanded edition of his 1522 *Betbüchlin*; and a new hymnal, the most expansive and well-organized of its kind to date.[1] Though each was in some way a recasting of an earlier work of Luther's—and though each would undergo further revision and expansion—the 1529 forms of catechism, prayerbook, and hymnal alike became paradigmatic both for Luther's own further revisions of the books and for their descendents and imitators *in genere*. When Luther reviewed the previous decades in his Church Postil preface of 1544, he named the Catechism, prayerbook, and hymnal, along with the postils and German Bible, as the great accomplishments of the reform.[2] These books formed an enduring foundation for Lutheran piety, bridging

[1] Markus Jenny, "Kirchenlied, Gesangbuch, und Kirchenmusik," in *Martin Luther und die Reformation in Deutschland* (Frankfurt/M, 1983), p. 305, points out the connection among these three volumes: *Enchiridion. Der kleine Catechismus fuer die gemeine Pfarher vnd Prediger, Gemehret vnd gebessert* (Wittenberg, 1529), WA 30,1:265–345; BSLK, pp. 501–542; BC, pp. 347–375; *Ein betbuechlin, mit eym Calender vnd Passional, hubsch zu gericht* (Wittenberg, 1529; facimile Kassel, 1982), WA 10,2:331–470; LW 43:11–45; *Geistliche Lieder auffs new gebessert zu Wittemberg* (Wittenberg, 1529). The 1529 hymnal must be reconstructed from early-modern descriptions and surviving editions (the earliest from 1533, repr. facimile: *Das Klug'sche Gesangbuch, 1533*, ed. Konrad Ameln [Kassel, 1954; repr. 1983]). See also Philipp Wackernagel, *Bibliographie zur Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenliedes im XVI. Jahrhundert* (Frankfurt/M, 1855; repr., Hildesheim, 1987), no. 280, pp. 108–09; Markus Jenny, *Luthers geistliche Lieder und Kirchengesänge*, Archiv zur Weimarer Ausgabe der Werke Martin Luthers 4 (Cologne, 1985), pp. 128–30, 324–40; also Robin Leaver, *'Goostly psalms and spirituall songes': English and Dutch Metrical Psalms from Coverdale to Utenhove, 1535–1566* (Oxford, 1991), pp. 281–85. It is pertinent to note that German has no distinct word for hymns as opposed to other songs, apart from adding the adjective "spiritual" [*Geistliche*] or compounding a word for "song" with the word for church). The usual term *Kirchenlied* is misleading if taken to suggest that the chief or only context of the songs was public worship. The identification of the songs as *geistliche Lieder* (or simply as *Psalmen*) is more common in the 16th century.

[2] WA 21:200–01; cf. Luther's location of the Church where prayer, hymns, and the Catechism are used, *Von den Konziliis und Kirchen* (1539), WA 50:641, LW 41:164.

between the public worship and teaching of the church and the private devotion of the household and reflecting an enduring Lutheran commitment to the use of the arts in the proclamation of the gospel.

The close connection of the three 1529 books is shown not only by their common format and coeval appearance but also by the complementarity of their contents. The program for Evangelical use of art adumbrated in Luther's preface to the "Passional" in the 1529 *Betbüchlin* was carried out also in the thematically overlapping cycles of illustrations in the Catechisms and hymnal. The Small Catechism contained morning, evening, and table prayers (including encouragement to sing a morning hymn); the prayerbook included expositions of parts of the Catechism (the Ten Commandments, Apostles' Creed, and Lord's Prayer). The hymnal printed prayers (collects) after several of its hymns and contained a section of hymns on the Catechism.

The amphibious existence of these books between church and home was also evident. The Small Catechism addressed itself both to the "common pastor" and to the "father of the household" as those responsible for the religious instruction of children. The prayerbook included discussions of the sacraments and confession. The hymnal was organized according to the church year and the catechism and included liturgical pieces but also elements clearly intended for domestic rather than liturgical use. All three books looked to the home as their primary locus for use as well as the market from which their printers would make a profit.

Coming in the wake of the 1528 Saxon visitation, whose results severely disappointed the Wittenberg reformers, the emphasis that these 1529 books and their descendents still placed on the household calls into question suggestions that Luther and his associates quickly abandoned early confidence in the home to rely on the strong arm of the state.[3] Luther sought to equip the household, not to abandon it. The success of not only the catechism but especially the hymnal and prayerbook in the 16th-century press suggests that the Lutheran clergy and the laity shared a common interest in the flourishing of Lutheran piety within the home.[4] This essay seeks to illumine that piety of song

[3] Gerald Strauss, *Luther's House of Learning: Indoctrination of the Young in the Lutheran Reformation* (Baltimore, 1978), pp. 5–9.

[4] The hymn-books and songsheets of early-modern Lutheranism are catalogued in Wackernagel, *Bibliographie*, also containing a number of hymnal prefaces, cited as WB by catalogue number; and (for sources containing music) in Konrad Ameln &

and prayer in both public and private contexts within 16th-century Lutheranism.[5]

Luther and Music in the Early Reformation

Luther's own intensive exposure to the musical culture of his time began in his school days, when he and other schoolboys sang in the choir for services and sang door to door for alms. As an adult, Luther was an accomplished amateur musician, proficient as a lutenist and a singer, and able to compose not only melodies for several of his hymns but also one short psalm motet in four parts. He corresponded on terms of friendship with some of the most prominent composers of his generation.[6] These musical interests and abilities did not so much

---

Markus Jenny, eds., *Das Deutsche Kirchenlied, DKL: kritische Gesamtausgabe der Melodien* 1, (Kassel, 1975), cited as *DKL* by year and sequence (e.g., 1524 05). The texts of the hymns are edited in Wackernagel, *Das deutsche Kirchenlied von der ältesten Zeit bis zu Anfang des XVII. Jahrhunderts*, 5 vols. (Leipzig, 1864–1867; repr., Hildesheim, 1990), which also supplements the bibliography of WB (cited as W1–W5 by hymn-number or by bibliographic number [bib.] and preface-number [pref.]); for the 17th century, *Das deutsche evangelische Kirchenlied des 17. Jahrhunderts*, eds. A. Fischer & W. Tümpel, 6 vols (Gütersloh, 1904–1916; repr., Hildesheim, 1964). Melodies for the hymns are edited in Johannes Zahn, *Die Melodien der deutschen evangelischen Kirchenlieder*, 6 vols (Gütersloh, 1889–1893; repr., Hildesheim, 1963) and in *Das deutsche Kirchenlied: Kritische Gesamtausgabe der Melodien, Part III: Die Melodien aus gedruckten Quellen bis 1680*, eds. Joachim Stalmann et al. (Kassel, 1993–).

[5] This essay draws on numerous previous efforts to summarize the role of music and hymns in the (Lutheran) Reformation, especially Markus Jenny, "Kirchenlied, Gesangbuch, und Kirchenmusik," in *Martin Luther und die Reformation in Deutschland: Ausstellung zum 500. Geburtstag Martin Luthers* (Frankfurt/M, 1983), pp. 293–322; Helga Robinson-Hammerstein, "The Lutheran Reformation and Its Music," in *The Transmission of Ideas in the Lutheran Reformation* (Dublin, 1989), pp. 141–71; Robin Leaver, "The Lutheran Reformation," in *Man and Music: The Renaissance: From the 1470s to the End of the 16th Century*, ed. Iain Fenlon (Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1989), pp. 263–85; Joyce Irwin, *Neither Voice Nor Heart Alone: German Lutheran Theology of Music in the Age of the Baroque* (New York, 1993); Joseph Herl, *Worship Wars in Early Lutheranism: Choir, Congregation, and Three Centuries of Conflict* (Oxford, 2004); Andrew Pettegree, *Reformation and the Culture of Persuasion* (Cambridge, 2005), pp. 40–75; Christopher Boyd Brown, *Singing the Gospel: Lutheran Hymns and the Success of the Reformation* (Cambridge, Mass., 2005). On prayer, see Paul Althaus, *Forschungen zur evangelischen Gebetliteratur* (Gütersloh, 1927; repr. Hildesheim, 1966); Martin Brecht, "'Und willst das Beten von uns han': Zum Gebet und seiner Praxis bei Martin Luther," in *Die frühe Reformation in Deutschland als Umbruch* (Gütersloh, 1989): 268–288; Traugott Koch, *Johann Habermanns "Betbüchlein" im Zusammenhang seiner Theologie: Eine Studie zur Gebetsliteratur und zur Theologie des Luthertums im 16. Jahrhundert* (Tübingen, 2001).

[6] See Robin Leaver, "Luther as Musician," *LQ* 18 (2004), 125–83. On Luther's compositions, see Markus Jenny, *Luthers geistliche Lieder*, pp. 14–17, and Leaver, "Luther

set Luther apart from his contemporaries as put him firmly in the midst of a flourishing burgher musical culture.[7] When official visitors from other German towns called on Luther, they joined in the singing around his table.[8]

Such a background was constructive but of course not determinative of Luther's theology and practice of music. Arguably the most accomplished musician among the 16th-century reformers was, after all, Ulrich Zwingli, whose rejection of music in public Christian worship was categorical.[9] In early years, Luther, too, could dwell on the abuses of religious music without much attention to its proper use.[10] Luther's vigorous advocacy of music among Christians as it developed over the years immediately following was shaped by his conflicts with the spiritualizing reforms of Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt and was bound up not only with Luther's doctrine of creation but also with his increasing emphasis on the external, oral Word, which music could carry and convey.

When Karlstadt celebrated Mass in the vernacular for the first time at Wittenberg on Christmas 1521, the liturgy was in German but spoken.[11] Luther's return to Wittenberg in the spring of 1522 brought about the restoration of Latin liturgy. Indeed, even after Luther had proposed a German service in 1526, Lutherans for centuries continued to prize the liturgical use of Latin alongside the vernacular. But at the same time Luther gave constructive shape to a program of music that became distinctive of the Wittenberg Reformation. His first complete proposal for an evangelical liturgy, the Latin *Formula Missae* of 1523, though it criticized excesses of medieval church music and ceremonial, nonetheless advocated the preservation of most of the traditional liturgy and

---

as Musician," pp. 161–66. Leaver's articles on Luther as musician, liturgist, and hymnwriter are now collected in *Luther's Liturgical Music: Principles and Implications* (Grand Rapids, 2007).

[7] See Carl Ferdinand Becker, *Die Hausmusik in Deutschland in dem 16, 17. und 18. Jahrhunderte* (Leipzig, 1840; repr. Hildesheim, 1973), p. 1.

[8] *Johannes Mathesius, Ausgewählte Werke*, ed. Georg Loesche, vol. 3, 2nd ed. (Prague, 1906), p. 434.

[9] See Markus Jenny, *Luther, Zwingli, Calvin in ihren Liedern* (Zürich, 1983); idem, *Zwinglis Stellung zur Musik im Gottesdienst* (Zurich, 1966); Charles Garside, *Zwingli and the Arts* (New Haven, 1966).

[10] WA 10,1,2:40–41.

[11] Karlstadt's 53 theses "De cantu Gregoriano," criticizing church music, are printed in Hermann Barge, *Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt*, 2nd ed. (Nieuwkoop, 1968) 1:491–93. Cf. his 1524 letter to Thomas Müntzer, quoted in Andrew Pettegree, *Reformation and the Culture of Persuasion* (Cambridge, 2005), p. 44.

its music, to be sung by the priest and choir.[12] But Luther also urged that, for the future, the people should sing songs in the vernacular interspersed among the Latin chants, until eventually the whole Mass could be sung in German. He identified a handful of existing vernacular religious songs that were suitable [*aliquid gravis spiritus sapiant*] and called on contemporary German poets to compose new pious hymns.[13]

Luther's own compositions of 1523 and 1524 explored various styles—*Ein neues Lied wir heben an*, a ballad on the first Lutheran martyrs; *Nun freut euch lieben Christen gmein*, described as "a fine spiritual song, showing how the sinner comes to grace"; German translations of Latin hymns by Ambrose, Sedulius, and others; and a series of hymns based on psalms, an important innovation that became the sole form of Christian song for much of the Reformed tradition, though for Luther it remained only one possibility among many.[14]

Hymns as Reformation Propaganda

For some of the hymns, Luther may have had liturgical purposes in mind from the beginning. But the primary context for their earliest distribution was decidedly extraliturgical. Most of the first Lutheran hymns were first printed in broadsheet form, though few copies of these survive.[15] Contemporaries record the public controversy provoked by the appearance of peddlers selling, and singing, Luther's psalm-hymns in the marketplace of German towns.[16] In addition to their circulation on cheap broadsheets, the hymns also lent themselves to memorization and circulation by word-of-mouth and letter, routes of dissemination that were extremely difficult for hostile authorities to interdict.[17] Indeed, the prohibition of Luther's 1522 German New Testament in ducal Saxony may have helped to provoke Luther's outpouring of vernacular hymns containing Biblical teaching as a means of circumventing the

---

[12] WA 12:208–09, LW 53:22–25.

[13] WA 12:218; LW 53:36–37.

[14] For the dating of Luther's hymns (in several cases differing from that given in WA 35), see Jenny, *Luthers geistliche Lieder*, pp. 55–61; on the origins of Luther's compositional activity and psalm-hymns, see ibid., pp. 12–13.

[15] Ibid., pp. 19–23.

[16] WB 133, p. 51; Inge Mager, "Lied und Reformation: Beobachtungen zur reformatorischen Singbewegung in norddeutsche Städten," *Das protestantische Kirchenlied im 16. und 17. Jahrhunderte*, ed. Alfred Dürr & Walther Killy (Wiesbaden, 1986), pp. 25–26.

[17] Robert Scribner, "Flugblatt und Analphabetentum," in *Flugschriften als Massenmedium der Reformationszeit* (Stuttgart, 1981), pp. 69–70.

ban.[18] The hymns and other songs thus took their place among the early flood of pamphlet propaganda in support of Reformation.[19] The conclusions of modern social historians are anticipated by a broad range of early-modern observers on either side of the emerging confessional divide, who pointed to the hymns as crucial elements in the spread—for good or for ill—of Luther's Reformation.[20] The German Jesuit Adam Contzen's complaint that "the hymns of Luther (and Beza) have killed more souls than their writing and preaching" has become famous. The Leipzig pastor and professor Cornelius Becker was more specific about the mechanisms of the spread of the hymns when he wrote

> That God's Word so rapidly spread forth from Saxony to other places in Germany, unhindered by the awful tyranny of the papacy, and succeeded so well, was promoted above all by Luther's psalms and other hymns since these could not be so easily interdicted as his other books and writings, as the hymns were spread in letters and in the minds and memory of pious Christians, and communicated to people in foreign places.[21]

Those who answered Luther's call to compose German hymns were predominantly clergy, such as Paul Speratus,[22] but included laymen such as the Nuremberg city secretary Lazarus Spengler[23] and Elizabeth Cruciger, wife of the Wittenberg professor Caspar Cruciger.[24] Among the most active of Luther's early supporters in the field of song was the Nuremberg shoemaker and *Meistersinger* Hans Sachs. Sachs' revisions (*contrafacta*) of pre-Reformation vernacular hymns enjoyed wide early popularity (1524–1526), but few survived as part of the enduring Lutheran repertoire, though his versified psalms were incorporated in

---

[18] Wichman von Meding, *Luthers Gesangbuch: Die gesungene Theologie eines christlichen Psalters* (Hamburg, 1998), p. 72.

[19] See Rebecca Wagner Oettinger, *Music as Propaganda in the German Reformation* (Aldershot, 2001).

[20] Eduard Emil Koch, *Geschichte des Kirchenlieds und Kirchengesangs der christlichen, inbesondere der deutschen evangelischen, Kirche* 1, 3rd ed. (Stuttgart, 1866), p. 244.

[21] Contzen, *Politicorum Libri Decem* (Mainz/Cologne, 1620), p. 100; Becker, WB 1060 (Leipzig, 1602), pref. 100, p. 680, translated in Brown, *Singing the Gospel*, p. 207, n. 50.

[22] Martin Brecht, "Erinnerung an Paul Speratus (1484–1551), ein enger Anhänger Luthers in den Anfängen der Reformation," *ARG* 94 (2003), 105–133. W3:55–61.

[23] Berndt Hamm, *Lazarus Spengler (1479–1534): Der Nuremberger Ratsschreiber im Spannungsfeld von Humanismus und Reformation, Politik und Glaube* (Tübingen, 2004). W3: 71–73.

[24] Mary Jane Haemig, "Elizabeth Cruciger (1500?–1535): The Case of the Disappearing Hymn Writer," *SCJ* 22 (2001), 21–44; Robin Leaver, *Elizabeth Creutziger, the Magdeburg Enchiridion 1536, & Reformation Theology* (Atlanta, 1995). W3:67–69.

Lutheran hymnals of the following decades.[25] Among the signs of the popular success of the new body of Lutheran hymns was their own use, amid the controversies following the defeat of the Schmalkaldic League, as the basis for new *contrafacta* protesting imperial religious policy.[26]

Though some of Sachs' religious compositions were deliberately based on secular models of song, that pattern of borrowing was not in fact typical of Luther's own hymns.[27] Lutherans generally limited such crossing of boundaries to songs intended for household rather than public use, though the best of such hymns eventually found their way into the churches as well, often after the original secular associations of the melody had been overshadowed by its new religious ones.[28] Luther's interest in bridging the cultural gap between popular song and ecclesiastical chant lay in the opposite direction, and several of his most popular hymns had melodies adapted from Gregorian chant.

The First Lutheran Hymn-Books

By 1524, printers were beginning to gather the hymns of Luther and others into collections—a small pamphlet with eight hymns in Nuremberg and Augsburg; the *Enchiridion* in Erfurt with twenty-five hymns, eighteen by Luther and seven by others.[29] These collections were intended for lay use, not only "to sing in the church, as is already the practice to some extent in Wittenberg," as the *Achtliederbuch* declared, but also "very beneficial for every Christian to have on hand for constant exercise and meditation on spiritual songs and psalms," as well as to instruct their children, as the *Enchiridion* promised both in its preface and on its title page. Not only public use but also private devotion and household pedagogy were in view.[30]

---

[25] On Sachs, see also Eckhard Bernstein, *Hans Sachs: Mit Selbstzeugnissen und Bilddokumenten* (Reinbeck bei Hamburg, 1993); W3:55–74, nos. 80–106.

[26] Oettinger, *Music as Propaganda*, chapter 5.

[27] See the discussion in Herl, *Worship Wars*, pp. 21–22.

[28] E.g., the contrafactum O *Welt ich muß dich lassen*: W3:1140. On the distinction between melodies appropriate for church and for private use, see, e.g., WB 908 (Nuremberg 1569), pref. 82, p. 641. For domestic religious collections set to secular melodies, see, e.g., WB 908, 910, 922, 923; W1 bib. 289.

[29] *DKL* 1524 12, 1524 13, 1524 14, 1524 07; *DKL* 1524 03, 1524 04, 1524 05. On the 1524 hymn-collections, see M. Jenny, WA Ar 4, pp. 19–24.

[30] See Markus Jenny, *Geschichte des deutschschweizerischen evangelischen Gesangbuches im 16. Jahrhundert* (Kassel, 1962), pp. 131–2.

Luther's 1524 entry into the publication of hymn-collections, on the other hand, was intended, at least principally, for the public instruction of the youth in the schools. The *Geystliche gesangk Buchleyn* contained hymns (twenty-four by Luther along with eight by others) in three, four, or five parts.[31] Though Luther may have made the selection of hymns (and had composed the melodies for several of his own), the settings were the work of Johann Walther, the Saxon court composer who had recently assumed the duties of choirmaster when the incumbent abandoned them under Karlstadt's influence.[32] An edition in one part "for the laity" appeared the following year, adopting the title of the Erfurt *Enchiridion*.[33]

Luther's participation in the publication of hymn-books continued throughout his life, with the 1529 Klug hymnal, the 1542 *Begräbnisgesänge*, and the 1545 Leipzig hymnal printed by Valentin Bapst. Luther's hymnals—and the prefaces he wrote for them—were reprinted throughout Germany and formed the core of the expanding Lutheran hymnals of the following century, many of which continued to identify themselves with Luther's name on the title page.[34] Not only Luther's hymns themselves but also his conception of music and the role of the hymns, as these were conveyed in the prefaces, were thus transmitted to a wide audience and to subsequent generations.

Luther's Theology of Music

Luther's 1524 preface, in a direct though anonymous rebuke to Karlstadt, insisted that the cultivation of artistic music for the church (including the polyphony contained in Walther's collection) was a support to the gospel rather than a distraction from it:

> Nor am I of the opinion that the gospel should destroy and blight all the arts, as some of the pseudo-religious [*abergeystlichen*] claim. But I would like to see all the arts, especially music, used in the service of him who gave and made them.[35]

---

[31] *DKL* 1524 18.

[32] Leaver, "Luther as Musician," p. 132.

[33] See Jenny, WA Ar 4, pp. 25–30; the title page of DKL 1526 11 suggests the existence of a previous edition.

[34] More than a quarter (250 of 970) of the DKL entries from 1524–1599 carry Luther's name on the title page.

[35] WA 35:474–5, LW 53:316.

Luther's identification of music as a creation and gift of God was profoundly influential within the Lutheran tradition.[36] He developed his thoughts in his 1538 preface to the Wittenberg music-publisher Georg Rhau's 1538 *Symphoniae Jucundae*.[37] There, Luther proclaimed, "next to the Word of God, music deserves the highest praise"—namely, for the profound influence of music over human emotions. In particular, Luther regarded music as cognate to the gospel in its power to bring joy to the sad[38] and used particularly the example of David's comfort of Saul (1 Sam. 16:23) to make that point.[39]

For Luther, music retained not only its power over the affections but also its goodness as a gift of God even when it was not put to explicitly religious use. His student Johann Mathesius fondly recalled Luther at table leading the singing of a Latin motet on Dido's last words from the *Aeneid*, a setting of which was among the pieces in Rhau's 1538 *Symphoniae*.[40] Lutheran clergy embraced secular music so long as it remained within the limits of moral decency. Following Luther, again, who in his 1524 preface had criticized students for singing "love ballads [*bul lieder*] and carnal songs," his successors in Lutheran pulpits criticized blasphemous, seditious, or unchaste lyrics—texts that abused the three estates of state, church, and household that God had ordained to order human life. Such music was an abuse of God's good creation. But they commended "honorable" secular music—though they did want to keep secular melodies of any sort, with their distracting associations, out of

---

[36] See Robin Leaver, "Luther on Music," *LQ* 20 (2006), 125–45; Irwin, *Neither Voice*, pp. 1–7; Patrice Veit, *Das Kirchenlied in der Reformation Martin Luthers: Eine thematische und semantische Untersuchung*, pp. 8–35; Oskar Söhngen, *Theologie der Musik* (Kassel, 1967); Carl. F. Schalk, *Luther on Music: Paradigms of Praise* (St. Louis, 1988); Paul Nettl, *Luther and Music*, tr. Frida Best and Ralph Wood (New York, 1967); Walter E. Buszin, "Luther on Music," *Musical Quarterly* 22 (1946), 80–97.

[37] Luther's 1530 outline is printed in WA 30.2:695–96. See Leaver, "Luther on Music," p. 126. The preface to the *Symphoniae* is WA 50:368–74; LW 53:321–24; repr., ed. Hans Albrecht (Kassel/St. Louis, 1959).

[38] See Leaver, "Luther on Music," pp. 130–34; Luther's letter to Ludwig Senfl, WA Br 5:639, no. 1727 (LW 49:427–28).

[39] Cf. WA 50:371 (LW 53:323); WA TR 1, p. 86 n. 194; *Von den letzten Worten Davids*, WA 54:34 (LW 15:273–74). See Irwin, *Neither Voice*, pp. 30–32 and Brown, *Singing the Gospel*, p. 50.

[40] Mathesius, *Ausgewählte Werke* 3:324; cf. WA 35:538–42.

the church.[41] Lutheran polemicists identified church music based on worldly melodies as a distinctly Roman Catholic abuse.[42]

Though the openness of Lutheran theologians to secular musical styles should not be exaggerated so far as church music was concerned, Lutherans did provide theological justification for the coexistence of spiritual and secular music in other important social contexts.[43] This helped Lutherans integrate their music into the structures of burgher society. The Nuremberg school adminstrator Erasmus Rotenbucher, for example, recalled the musical and religious contacts with "lovers of the gospel" he had enjoyed in the town's musical sodalities in the early years of the Reformation.[44] His 1551 collection of miners' songs [*Bergreihen*], combining (like Rhau's *Symphoniae*) religious and "worldly" texts, exemplifies the culture of such gatherings, as does Nuremberg bookseller Johann Ott's 1544 *Hundert und fünfftzehen guter newer Liedlein*, a collection of almost entirely "secular" songs whose preface, echoing Luther's own animadversions, contrasted the Lutheran embrace of music with Anabaptist and sectarian rejection of musical art on the one hand and papist abuse of music for idolatry on the other.[45]

Music and the Gospel

Nonetheless, for Luther, music had its highest purpose when it was joined with God's Word for the proclamation of the gospel.[46] That was Luther's original purpose in encouraging the composition of German metrical psalms, "so that the Word of God may abide among the people through song".[47] His 1524 preface again emphasized the identification of the hymns with the gospel:

> St. Paul… exhorted the Colossians to sing spiritual songs and Psalms heartily unto the Lord, so that God's Word and Christian doctrine might

---

[41] WA 35:474; see Brown, *Singing the Gospel*, pp. 50–51; Joyce Irwin, *Neither Voice*, pp. 35–37, though Irwin's anachronistic definition of "secular" as "morally neutral" (and failure to find such a concept among Lutheran writers) is unhelpful.

[42] Nicolaus Selneccer, WB 898 (Nuremberg 1569), pref. 79, p. 637, likely alluding to such compositions as the masses based on the tune *L'homme armée* by Dufay, Josquin des Prez, and Palestrina (e.g.).

[43] See Söhngen, *Theologie der Musik*, and Irwin's critique in *Neither Voice*.

[44] WB 637 (Nuremberg 1551), pref. 55, p. 594.

[45] WB 469 (Nuremberg 1544), pref. 42, p. 577.

[46] WA 50:371–372; LW 53:323.

[47] WA Br 3:220, no. 698 (LW 50:68).

> be instilled and implanted in many ways. Therefore I, too,… have with the help of others compiled several hymns, so that the holy gospel which now by the grace of God has risen anew may be set forth and given free course [*zu treyben und ynn schwanck zu bringen*].[48]

This conception of the hymns as containing and conveying the Word of God was definitive of Lutheran understanding and use of Evangelical hymnody in all contexts.[49] Early hymn printings boasted that their contents were "conformed to the pure Word of God" or "drawn from Holy Scripture".[50] Later hymnal prefaces echoed Luther's call to inculcate God's Word "in many ways".[51] Lutherans continued to acclaim the hymns as among the most important of the means by which the gospel had been proclaimed in the wake of Luther's reformation.[52] The hymns thus took their place alongside the sermon in the church as well as the proclamation of the Word in the home.

The identification of the hymns with the Word meant, in the first place, that the doctrinal content of the hymns was regarded as fully reliable. Though Luther called for German hymns written in simple, direct language, not a formal, courtly style, the theology of the hymns was not intended to be a compromised or minimal simplification.[53] Luther's own 1523 hymn *Dear Christians, one and all, rejoice* [*Nun freut euch, lieben Christen, g'mein*], for example, clearly presented Luther's teaching of the bound will, articulated at the 1518 Heidelberg Disputation and defended against Erasmus in Luther's 1525 book *De Servo Arbitrio*—the Latin theses of the university doctor of theology presented in direct, affective German verse.[54] It was this hymn that Tileman Heshusius especially identified as an instrument for the popular diffusion of Luther's teaching.[55] In the doctrinal controversies of the 1550s–1570s, Lazarus

---

[48] WA 35:474, LW 53:316 (translation altered).

[49] Gerhard Hahn, *Evangelium als literarische Anweisung: zu Luthers Stellung in der Geschichte des deutschen kirchlichen Liedes* (Munich, 1981).

[50] *DKL* 1524 12, 1524 13, 1524 14; 1525 06, 1525 08, 1526 02, 1526 13; cf. 1526 03, 1527 05, 1538 07, 1550 07, 1555 07, 1587 15.

[51] E.g., WB 745 (Erfurt 1557), pref. 63, p. 602; W1 bib. 218 (Leipzig 1579), pref. 17, p. 853; WB 996 (Leipzig 1587), pref. 93, pp. 664–65.

[52] For example: Johann Mathesius, WB 841 (Wittenberg 1562), pref. 70, pp. 613, 614; Nicolaus Selneccer, WB 898 (Nuremberg 1569), pref. 79, p. 637.

[53] WA Br 3:220, no. 698, LW 50:68.

[54] See the discussion in Brown, *Singing the Gospel*, pp. 16–19; also Hahn, *Evangelium*, pp. 104–33.

[55] Tileman Heshusius, quoted in Koch, *Geschichte des Kirchenliedes*, 1:244, translated in Brown, *Singing the Gospel*, p. 16.

Spengler's 1524 hymn *Durch Adams Fall* was quoted as evidence for the authentic Lutheran doctrine on original sin.[56]

One of the most prominent manifestations of Lutheran confidence in the hymns as vehicles for the Word of God was the development and use of a cycle of hymns based on the parts of the Catechism. Beginning with the 1529 Wittenberg hymnal, nearly all Lutheran hymnals for general use identified a section as *Katechismuslieder*. In the Large Catechism Luther recommended that pastors teach these hymns to the children as soon as they had learned the basic texts of the Commandments, Creed, Lord's Prayer, and the dominical institution of the sacraments.[57] By the end of his life Luther had composed hymns for each of the chief parts of the Catechism, echoing (or anticipating) the explanations of his 1529 Small Catechism. According to the church orders, these were almost universally appointed to be sung at the afternoon catechism services.[58]

But the catechism hymns were also intended, like the prose Catechism itself, to be used at home. Just as the Small Catechism was "the layman's Bible," so too the hymn-book was identified as the "*Loci Communes* of the laity" and "the little Bible," a means of learning and practicing the catechism also apart from the formal instruction of the church.[59] Cyriacus Spangenberg's boast echoed Roman Catholic complaints about the ubiquity of the hymns:

> Pious Luther put these chief parts of our Christian doctrine into such altogether fine, short, beautiful, and understandable songs, that a craftsman in his workshop, a peasant, husbandman, herdsman, and shepherd in the field, a charcoal-burner and woodcutter in the woods, sailors and fishermen on the water, carters, messengers, and other travelers on the road, children and servants at home, or whoever they may be (if they wish to be pious and have learned such hymns) can easily practice their catechism at any time, and at the same time make confession of their Christian faith, to honor God, to teach others and give a good example, and to comfort and benefit themselves.[60]

---

[56] W3:71; Formula of Concord, Solid Declaration 1.23, BSLK, p. 851; BC, p. 535.

[57] Large Catechism, short preface, §25, BSLK, p. 559; BC, p. 386.

[58] See the full treatment of the hymns both collectively and individually in Robin Leaver, "Luther's Catechism Hymns," *LQ* 11 (1997), 397–421; 12 (1998), 79–98, 161–180, 303–323.

[59] Cyriacus Spangenberg, WB 963 (Erfurt 1581), pref. 92.2, p. 658.

[60] C. Spangenberg, WB 963 (Erfurt 1581), pref. 92, p. 656.

Cornelius Becker argued that the hymns had made it possible for thousands, especially the illiterate, to learn the catechism who would otherwise have been unable to do so.[61]

The strong identification of the hymns with God's Word also meant that they could themselves serve as texts for exposition in the pulpit. Cyriacus Spangenberg's *Cithara Lutheri* was the most concentrated specimen of this genre, with a sermon on each of Luther's hymns as well as an introductory sermon defending his choice of texts: "Since in our hymnal nothing other than God's Word is to be found, I have not hesitated to preach and expound it".[62] But individual sermons on hymn-texts were common among Lutheran preachers, serving to draw the attention of the laity to the theological depths of the hymn, but also presupposing a congregation already well acquainted with its text.[63]

Above all, however, the Lutheran identification of the hymns with the Word meant that the hymns shared in the power of the gospel to create faith and comfort troubled consciences. As Johann Daubmann wrote in the preface of the 1569 Königsberg *Enchiridion*,

> I have gathered these hymns as a treasury in care and trouble, from which a Christian may and can comfort himself… so that the comfort presented us in the divine Word of God (which alone is able to save) may be manifest among all people. For the preaching of the gospel is always (as Paul says) a divine power to save all those who believe it.[64]

The hymnal prefaces boldly insisted that the Holy Spirit was at work through the hymns just as he was through the words of Scripture: "Such truth, life, and comfort are found in Scripture as well as in these songs which are spun out of God's Word".[65] "Without a doubt," wrote Paul Eber, "God is active [*krefftig*] by his Holy Spirit in the hearts of many who make devout [*mit ernst*] use of such Christian hymns"[66] Spangenberg could give a lengthy catalogue of the fruits of the Spirit produced by the singing of the hymns:

> God is praised… the human creature is spurred to true devotion; all the chief articles of divine doctrine (especially the promise of the gospel) are called to mind; the singer is strengthened; the neighbor is taught,

---

[61] Cornelius Becker, WB 1060 (Leipzig 1602), pref. 100, p. 680.
[62] C. Spangenberg, WB 963 (Erfurt 1581), pref. 92, pp. 653–56.
[63] Martin Rössler, *Die Liedpredigt: Geschichte einer Predigtgattung* (Göttingen, 1976).
[64] Johann Daubman, W1 bib. 164 (Königsberg 1569), pref. 11, p. 842.
[65] Johann Mathesius, WB 841 (Wittenberg 1562), pref. 70, p. 614.
[66] Paul Eber, WB 788 (Wittenberg 1560), pref. 67, p. 609.

> encouraged, and exhorted, and the hearts of both are comforted; the soul is rejoiced, the conscience stilled, hope increased, the cross lightened, fear and sadness are diminished; the angels are delighted, the devil put to flight and brought to shame.[67]

But the two most frequently recurring descriptions of the contents and fruit of Lutheran hymns in 16th-century hymnal prefaces are *Lehr*—doctrine—and *Trost*—comfort.[68] These two facets were all but inseparable: the hymns were comforting because of the doctrine they conveyed, and the effect and power of teaching the gospel was precisely to impart divine comfort. Johann Walther, reflecting in 1564 on the Lutheran hymn tradition that he had helped Luther establish with the *Geystliche gesangk Buchleyn* forty years earlier, placed these two elements, and their accessibility in the hymns to the laity, at the core of the definition of the Lutheran hymn-book:

> No one can adequately praise
> [Luther's] sweet book of hymns.
> How rich in the Spirit are all his songs;
> They contain much comfort and doctrine,
> With which a Christian in every need
> Can comfort and refresh himself.[69]

To be sure, Lutheran pastors and pedagogues were aware of the formal and poetic features that made the hymns, with their meter and rhyme, memorable, just as they were aware of and embraced the psychological power of music over human affections even apart from a spiritual text.[70] But an interpretation of the Lutheran use of the hymns as *merely* pedagogical, as if they were simply mnemonic instruments for imparting information, belies the Lutheran understanding of the external Word as the very (indeed, with an understanding of the sacraments as forms of the Word, the sole) means by which the Holy Spirit acted upon human

---

[67] C. Spangenberg, WB 896 (Eisleben 1568), pref. 77, p. 632.

[68] E.g., W1 bib. 95 (Magdeburg 1550), pref. 9; WB 745 (1557), pref. 63; WB 841 (Wittenberg 1562), pref. 70; WB 896 (Eisleben 1568), pref. 896; WB 898 (Nuremberg 1569), pref. 79; WB 81 (Tübingen 1569), pref. 81; W1 bib. 164 (Königsberg 1569), pref. 11; WB 947 (Strasbourg 1576), pref. 89a; W1 bib. 218 (Leipzig 1579), pref. 17; W1 bib. 220 (Nuremberg 1580), pref. 18; WB 963 (Erfurt 1581), pref. 92; WB 996 (Leipzig 1587), pref. 93; W1 bib. 289 (1589), pref. 26; WB 1052 (Hamburg, 1598), pref. 98; W1 bib. 416 (Hamburg, 1613), pref. 39. See Martin Rössler, "Lob—Lehre—Labsal: Theologie im Spiegel von Musik, Kirchenlied und Gesangbuch," *Jahrbuch für Liturgik und Hymnologie* 35 (1994/5), 116–23.

[69] W3:221.39, p. 195.

[70] See Brown, *Singing the Gospel*, pp. 51–53, 65–68.

beings for salvation.[71] And yet, even if the spiritual power of God's Word in the hymn texts was fundamental, the fact that in the hymns this Word was set to music was by no means beside the point. Following Luther, who appealed to the example of the "fathers and prophets [who] wanted nothing else to be associated as closely with the Word of God as music," and called the combination of music with the divine Word a *sonora praedicatio*, a "singing sermon," Lutherans attributed the highest power to the *combination* of text and music:[72]

> The texts of Holy Scripture are indeed of themselves the most beautiful music, which gives comfort and life amidst the pangs of death, and creates true gladness in the heart. But when a sweet and heartfelt tune is added, since a good melody is also the fair creation and gift of God, then the song acquires a new force and enters more deeply into the heart.[73]

Liturgy as Proclamation

The proclamation of the Word joined to music could take place in a variety of contexts: the streets and marketplaces of Germany where Luther's hymns were sung and sold on broadsheet; the schools where the schoolboys learned to sing the hymns in five-part harmony; the homes where parents and children taught and sang the hymns together. One of the most important qualities of the hymns was their ability to cross such boundaries. Nevertheless, among the central uses of the hymns was their role in the public worship of the Lutheran churches.

Already in his 1523 Latin *Formula Missae*, Luther had proposed to add German hymns to the Latin liturgy of the Mass. His own full proposal for a German service including hymns, the *Deutsche Messe*, appeared in 1526.[74] Neither of these remained long in use, even locally, in their original forms, being replaced even in Wittenberg by the church order of 1533.[75] Of far wider direct practical influence were Bugenhagen's

---

[71] See Luther, Schmalkald Articles, part 3, arts. 4–8, especially 3.8, §3–13, BSLK, pp. 449–56; BC, pp. 319–23.

[72] WA 50:371–72 (LW 53:323).

[73] Johann Mathesius, WB 841 (Wittenberg 1562), pref. 70, pp. 613–14, translation from Brown, *Singing the Gospel*, p. 52. Cf. Luther, WA 54:33 (LW 15:273–74).

[74] WA 19:72–113, LW 53:61–90.

[75] The church orders are edited in *Die evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des XVI. Jahrhunderts*, ed. Emil Sehling (Leipzig, 1902–; Tübingen, 1957–). For the Wittenberg 1533 order, see ibid., 1:700–10.

church orders (though these derived much, of course, from Luther),[76] and the Brandenburg-Nuremberg church order (along with Veit Dietrich's *Agendbüchlein* for rural parishes).[77] Strassburg, which under Martin Bucer's guidance occupied a position both theologically and liturgically poised between Wittenberg and the south German and Swiss towns, was a special case until the city became more conventionally Lutheran after the Peace of Augsburg.[78]

The liturgical reforms carried out under Luther's influence have often been characterized as conservative, but with only partial truth. Luther did protest that he had no intention of "abolishing the liturgical service of God" [*cultus Dei*], and Melanchthon pleaded in the Augsburg Confession against the charge of having abolished the Mass.[79] Lutherans retained many parts of the medieval Western liturgy and its music, in several cases even conserving medieval texts that the Council of Trent soon abolished within the Roman church. But liturgical conservatism and theological radicalism could well go hand in hand, as they did in the case of Thomas Müntzer, whose German liturgies hewed far more slavishly to their medieval models than did Luther's own later German Mass. Luther, assisted again by Johann Walther, insisted on carefully recasting the Latin chant to suit the different accentual patterns of the German language.[80]

Most importantly, within the Lutheran liturgies, even the pieces taken unmodified from the medieval liturgical tradition were placed within a radically new interpretation of the character and purpose of Christian worship.[81] Whether in Latin or in German, the central purpose of the

---

[76] The Braunschweig church order of 1528 and its many derivatives: see *Kirchenordnungen* 6,1:348–455.

[77] The Brandenburg-Nuremberg order of 1533 in *Kirchenordnungen* 11:140–205; Veit Dietrich's 1545 *Agendbüchlein*, ibid., pp. 487–553.

[78] An edition of the Strasbourg church order is planned for volume 20 of *Kirchenordnungen*; see A.E. Richter, *Die evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des sechszehnten Jahrhunderts* (Leipzig, 1846), pp. 231–38, and the Strasbourg liturgy of 1539 in *Liturgies of the Western Church*, ed. Bard Thompson (Philadelphia, 1980), pp. 159–81.

[79] Augsburg Confession 24.1 (BSLK p. 91; BC, p. 68).

[80] WA 18:123, LW 40:141. See Konrad Ameln, "Über die Sprachmelodie in den geistlichen Gesängen Martin Luthers, *Quaestiones in Musica: Festschrift für Franz Krautwurst zum 65. Geburtstag* (Tutzing, 1989), pp. 13–31. A more appreciative assessment of Müntzer's liturgical music is offered by Karl Honemeyer, *Thomas Müntzer und Martin Luther: Ihr Ringen um die Musik im Gottesdienst. Untersuchungen zum 'Deutsch Kirchenampt,' 1523* (Berlin, 1974).

[81] Vilmos Vajta, *Die Theologie des Gottesdienstes bei Luther*, 2nd ed. (Göttingen, 1954); tr. Ulrich S. Leupold, *Luther on Worship: An Interpretation* (Philadelphia, 1958).

"liturgical service of God," as Luther understood it, was to proclaim the gospel: "Everything is to be done for the sake of God's Word, so that it may have free course [*ym schwang gehe*] and ever restore and give life to souls, that they may not become weary".[82] This was also the specific purpose assigned to the hymns in Luther's 1524 preface to the *Geystliche gesangk Buchleyn*: "to give the holy gospel free course [*ynn schwanck zu bringen*]".[83]

In the Augsburg Confession Melanchthon insisted on the fundamentally pedagogical character of all liturgical ceremonies, "to teach the unlearned". Here again the vernacular hymns were a primary example.[84] Teaching the gospel (as the German text had it, "what [the people] need to know about Christ") was "the chief worship of God".[85] Worship, then [*cultus Dei* or *latreia*], was not the human duty of rendering to God the quantum of honor due him, but proclaiming and believing the gospel. Or, in other terms, such faith in the divine promise was precisely the honor God had commanded and desired: "This faith gives honor to God, gives him what is properly his; it obeys him by accepting his promises… The greatest comfort comes from this doctrine that the highest worship in the gospel is the desire to receive the forgiveness of sins, grace, and righteousness".[86]

The most profound liturgical consequence of Lutheran theology was the complete excision of the Canon of the Mass, which Luther replaced with the Words of Institution accompanied by the Lord's Prayer.[87] The Words of Institution, formerly contained within the Canon and recited by the celebrant in a low voice intended to be inaudible to the congregation, were now according to Luther and the church orders to be chanted aloud using the same chant assigned to the gospel reading.[88] Though the different Lutheran church orders varied in liturgical detail—in some cases the Preface was retained, in others replaced or supplemented by an admonition to communicants—they

---

[82] *Von Ordnung Gottesdiensts in der Gemeine* (1522), WA 12:36; LW 53:13 (translation altered).

[83] WA 35:474; LW 53:316.

[84] Augsburg Confession 24.3 (BSLK, p. 91; BC, pp. 68–69).

[85] Apology 15.42 (BSLK, p. 305; BC, p. 229); cf. WA 19:78.

[86] Apology 4.309–310 (BSLK, p. 220; Tappert p. 155). See the systematic collation of texts in James Brauer, *Worship, Gottesdienst, Cultus Dei: What the Lutheran Confessions Say about Worship* (St. Louis, 2005).

[87] WA 19:96–98, WA 12:212–13.

[88] WA 19:97–98. See Robin Leaver, "Theological Consistency, Liturgical Integrity, and Musical Hermeneutics in Luther's Liturgical Reforms," *LQ* 9 (1995), 123–29.

were unanimous in removing the Canon and—with two exceptions to prove the overwhelming validity of the rule—did not replace it with a new eucharistic prayer.[89] In this Lutherans set themselves apart not only from the Roman Mass but also from the Reformed liturgies of Strassburg, Zurich, Geneva, or Canterbury.[90] The depth and breadth of Lutheran theological antipathy to any such liturgical restoration is suggested by the common resistance offered by Matthias Flacius and Philipp Melanchthon to the Eucharistic prayer championed by Johann Agricola in the wake of the Interims.[91] Instead of the Canon or its substitute, Christ's Words of Institution in the Lutheran liturgies stood on their own as a proclamation of the gospel to the congregation.[92]

Within this liturgical theology of proclamation the vernacular hymns found their place. Unlike Calvin, who regarded the metrical psalms sung by the Genevan congregation chiefly as a form of prayer addressed to God, Lutherans regarded the hymns as being a mode of proclamation of the gospel, of a piece with the sermon.[93] Johann Brenz declared, "when we speak of the preaching of the Word of God, we do not understand only that preaching which takes place publicly in the pulpit, but also what takes place in the public songs of the church… the Holy Spirit works the same things in us through the singing of the church".[94]

---

[89] The exceptions are the Swedish service book of 1576 and the Pfalz-Neuburg order of 1543; see Leaver, "Theological Consistency," p. 130.

[90] Ibid. Leaver associates Bucer and Zwingli's liturgies with Luther's on this point. But both of these specified a lengthy prayer to be said at the Table before the account of the institution of the Supper that must be seen as a substitute for the Canon: *Liturgies of the Western Church*, pp. 154, 172–77, and Calvin's liturgy pp. 202–05. Cranmer attempted an Evangelical recasting of the Canon for the *Book of Common Prayer*, ibid., pp. 256–59, 280–81.

[91] Oliver K. Olson, *Matthias Flacius and the Survival of Luther's Reform* (Wiesbaden, 2002), pp. 118–23.

[92] Robin Leaver, "Theological Consistency," pp. 117–38; Dorothea Wendebourg, "Den falschen Weg Roms zu Ende gegangen? Zur gegenwärtigen Diskussion über Martin Luthers Gottesdienstreform und ihr Verhältnis zu den Traditionen der Alten Kirche," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 94 (1997), 437–467; Brian Spinks, *Luther's Liturgical Criteria and his Reform of the Canon of the Mass* (Bramcote, 1982).

[93] On Calvin, see Charles Garside, *The Origins of Calvin's Theology of Music*, Transactions of the American Philosophical Society 69 (1979), p. 17; WB 448, pref. 39, pp. 575–76, tr. Garside, *Origins*, pp. 31–33.

[94] Johann Brenz, quoted in Walter Blankenburg, "Der Gottesdienstliche Liedgesang der Gemeinde," *Leiturgia: Handbuch des evangelischen Gottesdienstes* 4 (Kassel, 1961), pp. 567–68.

Worship and the Universal Priesthood

When Luther spoke of all Christians as priests in the context of worship, as he did not only in his 1520 *Babylonian Captivity of the Church* but also in his 1544 sermon at the consecration of the castle church in Torgau, it was especially their proclamation of God's Word that he had in mind.[95] But Luther did not conclude from this principle that the whole congregation of Christians was obliged to sing the entire service, any more than the common priesthood obviated the appointment of public ministers to preach and administer the sacraments for the whole congregation. Instead, in application to worship, Luther concluded that the whole service, however its acts might be divided among ministers, choir, and laity, was the common action and property of the whole congregation: "So also they all pray and sing and give thanks together; here there is nothing that one possesses or does for himself alone; but what each one has also belongs to the other".[96]

Modern scholars have sometimes been frustrated not to find in Luther or his successors a theology of worship that insisted that the lay congregation *must* sing in the vernacular—or have instead projected such a theology back onto him.[97] Luther associated such insistence on the *necessity* of a particular quantity of vernacular lay participation in worship with Karlstadt's legalism.[98] The Lutheran innovation was not to insist that the lay congregation *must* perform any particular part of the liturgy but rather to insist that the laity *could* undertake any portion of the service—and that such lay participation was as much an organic part of the liturgy as what the pastor himself or the choir did. Luther understood even the Words of Institution, though chanted aloud by the pastor alone, as being the responsibility of the whole congregation.[99] Luther's theology of worship stood in stark contrast to the late medieval

[95] WA 49:590–91, LW 51:335. Cf. Luther's 1535 sermons on Ps. 110, WA 41:210, LW 13:332.

[96] WA 49:600, LW 51:343. Luther's doctrine of the universal priesthood has been taken as the key to his liturgical program by Walter Buszin, "The Doctrine of the Universal Priesthood and Its Influence Upon the Liturgies and Music of the Lutheran Church," *The Musical Heritage of the Church*, ed. Theodore Hoelty-Nickel (Valparaiso, IN, 1946) and Carl Schalk, *Luther on Music*, pp. 42–45.

[97] Joseph Herl, *Worship Wars*, pp. 17–21, criticizes accounts basing Luther's liturgical reforms on the doctrine of the universal priesthood, though Herl overstates his own case, e.g., denying that the Torgau sermon invokes the doctrine.

[98] *Wider die himmlischen Propheten* (1525), WA 18:123, LW 40:141.

[99] *Von der Winkelmesse und Pfaffenweihe* (1533), WA 38:248–49, LW 38:209.

theology of the Mass, according to which everything that was essential was read by the priest from the missal as at a low or private Mass.[100]

Congregational Singing

Within the Lutheran liturgies, as described in the church orders, vernacular hymns could be substituted for any of the psalmody of the Mass (the introit and gradual psalms), and places for hymns were often specified before or after the sermon and during the communion. The fixed parts of the Mass—Kyrie, Gloria, Credo, Sanctus, and Agnus Dei—also had vernacular or congregational substitutes available, so that, indeed, a German Lutheran Mass could be sung in German, by congregation and pastor, from beginning to end, just as Luther had envisioned in 1523. On the other hand, a choir, if available, might sing any of these parts in Latin. As a result, the actual conduct of a 16th-century Lutheran service, its linguistic content, and the roles of choir and congregation could vary considerably. In practice, the impulse toward vernacular services sung by the congregation coexisted already in Luther's liturgical and hymnological projects of the 1520s with a strong emphasis on the role of the schoolboys and their choir to ensure a continuing and prominent role for Latin choral singing in Lutheran worship, at least in the towns and churches that had such schools.

The prevalence of opportunities for German congregational song should not, however, be underestimated. The large majority of church orders, reflecting Luther's theological indifference about *who* sang the liturgy, simply do not specify whether a part of the liturgy must be sung by the choir or by the congregation. Orders distinguishing between arrangements for town and rural parishes tend to emphasize Latin and choral music for the towns and German services for the countryside. Very few, even among the town orders, insist on an entirely Latin choral service. Ecclesiastical visitations inquired about congregational singing as a basic expectation of parish life.[101] Throughout the century there is growing evidence of regular cycles of vernacular hymns sung accord-

[100] Josef Jungmann, *The Mass of the Roman Rite: Its Origins and Development (Missarum Sollemnia)* tr. Francis A. Brunner (New York, 1951; repr. Westminster, MD, 1986), 1:229–30.

[101] Joseph Herl, *Worship Wars*, presents information on 16th- and 17th-century church orders in tabular form, pp. 55, 205–45 though their *statistical* value is highly questionable for reasons to which Herl alludes, p. 206. He discusses visitations pp. 69–86. Herl's own presentation of this material emphasizes the role of choirs over

ing to the season or particular Sunday of the liturgical year, a pattern to which the laity developed a nice sensitivity.[102] The fundamental Lutheran innovation was that all these options, liturgies sung in Latin or German, by the choir or the congregation or a combination thereof, were regarded as being theologically equivalent.

The range of options available to Lutherans at mid-century was displayed in Johann Spangenberg's *Cantiones Ecclesiasticae/Kirchengeseng Deutsch*, published at Luther's behest in 1545.[103] The two parallel halves of the work, in Latin and German, gave textual and musical materials for the conduct of worship in either language or both. Spangenberg's preface explained, "Latin and German are here placed alongside each other, the Latin for the students and learned, the German for the laity and unlearned, so that each one may have something to quicken his heart in worship".[104]

Though it is not difficult to find 16th-century clerical complaints about congregational singing, or indeed nearly any other subject, congregational participation in vernacular singing in Lutheran congregations seems to have become rather successful.[105] In the seven volumes of Karl Pallas' edition of electoral Saxon visitation reports from the 16th and 17th centuries, there are only eighteen complaints about weak congregational singing—five from the 16th century, with one complaint in 1577 and four from the 1598 visitation, and then five in 1602, four in 1608, two in 1618 and two in 1672.[106] Most interesting, perhaps, are congregational complaints about their pastors' tinkering

---

against the congregation in 16th-century Lutheranism—though his data are patient of different interpretation.

[102] Rochus Frh. von Liliencron, *Liturgisch-musikalische Geschichte der evangelischen Gottesdienste von 1523 bis 1700* (Schleswig, 1893; repr. Hildesheim, 1970), pp. 45–83; W. Reindell, *Das de tempore-Lied des ersten Halbjahrhunderts der reformatorischen Kirche* (Würzburg, 1942); Herl, *Worship Wars*, pp. 154–56.

[103] WB 477; DKL 1545 14, 15, 16, 17. See Robin Leaver, "Johann Spangenberg and Luther's Legacy of Liturgical Chant," *LQ* 19 (2005), 23–42.

[104] WB 477 (Magdeburg 1545), pref. 47, pp. 582–83.

[105] Luther's own complaints from the late 1520s are cited in Herl, *Worship Wars*, pp. 14–15. On evaluating the rhetoric of praise and blame in clerical sources, see Brown, *Singing the Gospel*, pp. 167–69.

[106] Herl, *Worship Wars*, pp. 70–76, identifies and summarizes all the material he finds in Pallas referring to congregational singing. He counts complaints differently, apparently taking instructions to cantors and choirs as implicit criticism of congregational singing and including congregational complaints about the pastor's singing. Certainly his conclusion (p. 75) that "nearly two-thirds of the reports indicate that the people did not sing, or sang poorly"—scil., two-thirds of reports he identifies as mentioning singing, not two-thirds of all visitation reports—is seriously misleading. See *Die*

with Luther's hymns or selection of obscure new ones, or failure to provide adequate opportunities for lay singing, sentiments that reflect positive lay expectations for participation in congregational song that must be placed alongside clerical complaints about the laity.

Lutheran Hymns in Medieval Context

From the viewpoint of Lutherans at the beginning of the 17th century, Luther's pioneering innovation in establishing vernacular hymnody seemed self-evident. Johann Gerhard wrote, "The glorious, salutary, and useful practice of exercising oneself with German psalms and pious songs, and spreading the praise of God, had completely collapsed, until (as aforesaid) it was reestablished in the church of God by the faithful service of the sainted Luther".[107]

But the novelty of Lutheran use of vernacular hymns in public worship has been called into question. The early Lutherans themselves could be cited on either side. At the time of the 1530 Diet of Augsburg, the Saxon Lutherans evidently judged that their vernacular singing required some defense. The so-called Torgau Articles had included a separate article "On German Singing," and Melanchthon incorporated that material in the twenty-fourth article of the Augsburg Confession.[108] On the other hand, in the Apology Melanchthon argued that the at least occasional use of vernacular hymns was a well-established pre-Reformation custom, though with regional variation.[109]

Clearly, there were German religious songs before the Reformation, their existence proven, *inter alia*, by the Reformers' own appropriation of many of them, and their criticism of many others. The 1533

Registraturen der Kirchenvisitationen im ehemals sächsischen Kurkreise, ed. Karl Pallas, 7 vols. (Halle, 1906–1918).

[107] Johann Gerhard, preface to Mauritius Moltzer, *Christlich Gesangbuch Uber alle Son- und Feyer-Tägliche heilige Evangelia und Episteln* (Jena, 1619), fol. 8a?, translated Brown, *Singing the Gospel*, p. 207 n. 49.

[108] Augsburg Confession 24,2, BSLK pp. 91–92, BC, p. 68; *Sources and Contexts of the Book of Concord*, eds. Robert Kolb and James A. Nestingen (Minneapolis, 2001), p. 104. Melanchthon's draft preface to the Augsburg Confession also drew attention to the German hymns as an innovation: BSLK p. 42.

[109] Apology 24.3–5 (BSLK p. 350; BC, p. 258). The *Confutatio Pontifica* did not specifically take issue with German singing, but defended the use of Latin, denying that it was necessary for lay Christians to understand the words of the Mass so long as they understood its purpose, and pointing out that the Lutherans themselves did not celebrate the Mass entirely in German. *Sources and Contexts*, pp. 127–28.

Wittenberg hymnal included a section of "old songs… as a witness to certain good Christians who lived before us in the great darkness of false doctrine, so that it may be seen how there were nonetheless always people who knew Christ aright and were miraculously preserved in that knowledge through God's grace".[110] Luther especially treasured the pre-Reformation hymns *Ein Kindelein so löbelich* and *Gott sei gelobet und gebenedeiet*.[111] The cantor Nicolaus Herman, on the other hand, regarded the medieval vernacular songs that invoked the aid of Mary and the saints while portraying Christ as a "strict judge" as paradigmatic of the problems of pre-Reformation religion, though he could also point to the ancient (Latin) office hymns as a vehicle for preserving the gospel under the papacy.[112]

The use of pre-Reformation vernacular songs by the laity in public worship, however, is more difficult to establish.[113] The clearest evidence for the incorporation of vernacular song in the liturgy comes from German convents and hence does not speak to the broader question of lay vernacular singing.[114] But to contemporary observers like the Annaberg chronicler Valten Hanffstengel (1499–1582), the Lutheran introduction of vernacular song in the Mass was an act of religious revolution equal to clerical marriage, the breaking of images, and the distribution of the Sacrament to the laity in both kinds:

> 1524. This year there arose great strife with the monks and nuns, who ran from the cloister; the priests took women in marriage; and then Mass was held in German. The Sacrament was also distributed in both kinds, and German hymns were sung. Then the destruction of the holy images with violence began, through Dr. Luther's writing, which the territorial lord [Duke George of Saxony] strongly opposed and held firmly to the papacy. Nonetheless the people were emboldened and held up Luther's doctrine as the pure religion, published psalters and hymnals.[115]

---

[110] *Luthers geistliche Lieder*, p. 331.

[111] WA 9:518 (included in the Festpostil, WA 17,2:329); WA 17.2:306, 19:149, 29:44, 41:493, 45:344, 38:245.

[112] WB 841 (Wittenberg 1562), pref. 70, p. 615.

[113] Johannes Janota, *Studien zu Funktion und Typus des deutschen geistlichen Liedes im Mittelalter* (Munich, 1968).

[114] Walther Lipphardt, "Die liturgische Function deutscher Kirchenlieder in den Klöstern Niedersächsischer Zisterzienserinnen des Mittelalters," *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 94 (1972), 158–98, discussed by Herl, *Worship Wars*, pp. 31–32.

[115] *Kritische Ausgabe der Chronik des Valentin Hanffstengel* "*Wie das Bergwerck auffn Schreckenberg ist auffkommen und darnach die Stadt Annaberg gebauet worden*," ed. Helmut Unger (Annaberg-Buchholz, 1996), p. 9, translated Brown, *Singing the Gospel*, pp. 206–07, n. 47.

After the Reformation German Roman Catholic diocesan authorities tended to identify vernacular hymn-singing as a distinctly Protestant behavior. Their response was often to issue blanket prohibitions of all vernacular religious song, not merely what was heretical.[116] Roman Catholics who attempted to counter Protestant success by publishing Catholic vernacular song long faced the suspicion and hostility of their coreligionists. Though the Bautzen cathedral dean Johann Leisentrit, the most active of 16th-century Catholic hymnal-editors, bewailed the cancerous spread and influence of Protestant vernacular singing, which he attributed to the "poverty of Catholic songs," he fell under the suspicion of the other Catholic clergy and was saved from condemnation only by the intervention of the pope himself.[117] Leisentrit and other Roman Catholics formed their hymnals not chiefly by drawing upon an existing repertoire of medieval song but by writing new hymns and adapting Lutheran ones. Of the 249 hymns in Leisentrit's 1567 hymnal, only eighteen were pre-Reformation vernacular songs; a third were adopted from Protestant hymnals; a third were apparently Leisentrit's own new work; and the rest were other post-Reformation Catholic compositions or translations of Latin texts.[118] All of this undermines any strong claim for the extent and popular significance of pre-Reformation vernacular song.

Choirs, Latin, and Schools

If the use of German hymns in Lutheran public worship was perceived by contemporaries as an innovation, neither did 16th-century Lutherans regard their continuing use of Latin in worship as a matter simply of liturgical inertia. Instead, it was an integral part of Lutheran pedagogy with its ideal of teaching the "three languages," Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, alongside the vernacular.[119] In a society in which all but the most elementary education was carried out in Latin, students were punished for lapses into the vernacular language. If the schoolboys were to sing, therefore, the presumption was that it must be in Latin.

---

[116] Strauss, *Luther's House*, p. 233 n. 37 (on Bavaria); Alexander J. Fisher, *Music and Religious Identity in Counter-Reformation Augsburg, 1580–1630* (Aldershot, 2004), pp. 280–283.

[117] Walther Lipphardt, *Johann Leisentrits Gesangbuch von 1567* (Leipzig, 1963), p. 33.

[118] Ibid., pp. 74–79.

[119] See, e.g., *An die Ratherrn… daß sie Christliche Schulen aufrichten und halten sollen*, WA 15:37–41, LW 45:359–64.

Though not all 16th-century Latin schools gave a prominent role to music in their curricula (Erasmus himself had expressed views much like those of Karlstadt or Zwingli on the religious value of music), Lutheran schools almost invariably did.[120]

Lutheran schools participated in, though they did not originate, the transformation of musical instruction from emphasis on music as a branch of mathematics [*musica theoretica*] to a practical subject emphasizing performance.[121] At Luther's insistence musical training and proficiency was a prerequisite for teaching or pastoral service as well as a path for advancement.[122] Both teaching in the schools and service as cantor—a position that included responsibilities both for the school and for the church—were often steps on the Lutheran *cursus honorum* leading to the pastoral office.[123] Several Evangelical musicians and teachers became leaders of reform in their communities, such as Nicolaus Herman in Joachimsthal or Wolf Heinz in Halle.[124] But for the majority of Latin school students who did not follow vocations as church musicians, the musical pedagogy of Lutheran schools equipped them with the musical ability that burgher society expected, closely intertwined with Lutheran religion.[125] The graduates of the Latin school, now prominent members of the community and town government, might continue to sing with the choir in public services and to direct

---

[120] See Garside, *Zwingli and the Arts*, pp. 32–33. The humanist school organized by Johann Sturm at Strasbourg gave little role to music beyond unison chanting of the psalter. See Lewis Spitz and Barbara Sher Tinsley, *Johann Sturm on Education: The Reformation and Humanist Learning* (St. Louis, 1995), pp. 304–05, p. 104, p. 243. Contrast Luther's insistence on music in the curriculum, *An die Ratherrn*, WA 15:46, LW 45:369; *Unterricht der Visitatoren*, WA 26:237, 239, LW 40:316, 319. On humanism and music in the schools, see Édith Weber, "L'influence de l'Humanisme sur les formes musicales en Allemagne au XVIe siècle," in *Musique et Humanisme à la Renaissance* (Paris, 1993), pp. 119–36; Nan Cooke Carpenter, *Music in the Medieval and Renaissance Universities* (Norman, OK, 1958), pp. 362–67.

[121] Leaver, "Luther as Musician", p. 147; Ralph Lorenz, "Pedagogical implications of "musica practica" in 16th-century Wittenberg" (Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1995).

[122] WA TR 5:557, no. 6248; Leaver, "Luther as Musician," pp. 146–47.

[123] Helga Robinson-Hammerstein, "Lutheran Reformation," pp. 158–59, citing *inter alia* Johannes Rautenstrauch, *Luther und die Pflege der kirchlichen Musik in Sachsen (14.–19. Jahrhundert)…* (Leipzig, 1907; repr. Hildesheim, 1970). See also Arno Werner, *Vier Jahrhunderte im Dienste der Kirchenmusik: Geschichte des Amtes und Standes der evangelischen Kantoren, Organisten und Stadtpfeifer seit der Reformation* (Leipzig 1933).

[124] On Herman, see Brown, *Singing the Gospel*, pp. 36–40; on Wolf Heinz, see Leaver, "Luther's Catechism Hymns," *LQ* 12 (1998), 164–66.

[125] Cf Susan Gattuso, "16th-Century Nuremberg," in Iain Fenlon, ed., *Man and Music: The Renaissance*, pp. 288–93; Brown, *Singing the Gospel*, p. 44.

their musical interests and patronage to religious ends.[126] The pieces published in Georg Rhau's 1542 *Sacrorum Hymnorum Liber Primus*, for example, were gathered from manuscripts collected and copied by the Lutheran burghers of Joachimsthal.[127]

The Latin schools made use of the ancient Latin hymns by such fathers as Ambrose, Prudentius, and Sedulius, not only singing them but also using them to explain the Christian faith. Lucas Lossius' 1553 *Psalmodia, hoc est, Cantica Sacra Veteris Ecclesiae Selecta* saw six editions before the end of the century.[128] Lutherans also undertook to write new hymns in Latin, from the classical poems of humanists like Melanchthon and Joachim Camerarius to the rhymed rhythmic Latin couplets into which the cantor Nicolaus Herman set the gospel lessons throughout the year for the schoolboys.[129] On the other hand, the new German hymns themselves started to appear in Latin translation, so that, for example, *Ein feste Burg ist unser Gott* could be sung in the schools as *Arx firma noster est Deus*, a sign that creative initiative and priority were shifting to the vernacular as the Latin became derivative.[130]

To Lutheran minds the Latin singing of the school choir was by no means an abnegation of the role of music as a vehicle for proclamation. After all, the students who sang—and those in the congregation who were themselves graduates of the school—were expected to understand the text they sang. Lutherans referred the criterion of linguistic comprehensibility to those who sang [*cantus a cantantibus intellectus*], not necessarily to all those who listened to the singing.[131] The schoolboys were called upon to serve as interpreters by explaining the Latin texts they sang in the church and school to their parents. Worship in Latin as well as in the vernacular was, moreover, in keeping with Saint

---

[126] Robinson-Hammerstein, "Lutheran Reformation," pp. 160–61.

[127] Georg Rhau, *Sacrorum Hymnorum Liber Primus*, ed. Rudolf Gerber (Leipzig, 1942).

[128] DKL 1553 10; 1569 24; 1579 08; 1580 18; 1595 10; 1595 11.

[129] Melanchthon, W2, pp. 266–70; Camerarius, W2, pp. 321–24; on Herman, see Brown, *Singing the Gospel*, pp. 59–64.

[130] Wolfgang Ammonius, *Libri tres Odarum ecclesiasticarum, de sacris Cantionibus, In Ecclesiis Germanicis, Augustanam Confessionem amplectentibus, ad similes numeros, modos & concentus Musicos, carmine conversis* (Leipzig, 1579); cf. DKL 1581 01; 1583 01; 1586 01; 1591 01. For the text, see W1, no. 602, p. 337.

[131] Johann Brenz, quoted in Walter Blankenburg, "Der Gottesdienstliche Liedgesang der Gemeinde," *Leiturgia: Handbuch des evangelischen Gottesdienstes* 4 (Kassel, 1961), pp. 567–68. Cf. Luther's insistence on "verständliche" prayers and hymns, *On the Councils and the Church* (1539), WA 50:641, LW 41:164.

Paul's permission for speaking in tongues in the Christian assembly (1 Cor. 14)—a passage understood until the 19th century as referring to polyglot worship rather than ecstatic glossolalia—as well as Luther's insistence on maintaining the languages, at least Latin if not Greek and Hebrew as well, alongside the vernacular in public worship.[132] But the continuing use of Latin alongside German also expressed a Lutheran refusal to employ only the lowest shared level of culture in the public worship of the church.

This commitment to using a wide range of cultural forms, from high to popular, in the service of the gospel greatly enriched Lutheran music. The range of musical forms cultivated in Lutheran public worship, from simple vernacular chorales sung by the congregation to Gregorian chant to polyphony—was wider than for any other confessional group in early-modern Europe.[133] The Lutheran clergy of the 16th century followed Luther in encouraging this development both practically and theologically, even hailing the invention of polyphony as a providential gift of God for the spread of the gospel.[134] Lutheran music was not insular—it incorporated, over time, new musical styles from Flanders and Italy—but it did develop its own distinct tradition. Luther's own associates Johann Walther and Georg Rhau, in the first generation of the Reformation, helped to establish patterns of Lutheran musicianship.[135] Among the key elements of continuity in the tradition were the vernacular hymns themselves—their texts and melodies—to which each successive generation of Lutheran composers returned and on which they drew.

Lutherans also made use of instrumental music in their worship, defending the practice against the scruples of the Reformed and certain strands of Roman Catholic asceticism alike.[136] The use of the organ, however, to accompany congregational singing did not develop until the very end of the 16th century at the earliest.[137] The musicians themselves usually served not only the church but the town government as well, and enjoyed social respectability in rough proportion to their

---

[132] WA 19:74, LW 53:63.

[133] Cf. R. Po-Chia Hsia, *Social Discipline in the Reformation: Central Europe 1550–1570* (London, 1989), p. 107.

[134] Brown, *Singing the Gospel*, p. 51.

[135] Carl Schalk, *Music in Early Lutheranism: Shaping the Tradition (1524–1672)* (St. Louis, 2001).

[136] Irwin, *Neither Voice*, pp. 13–21; Brown, *Singing the Gospel*, pp. 46–49.

[137] Herl, *Worship Wars*, pp. 130–51.

ecclesiastical involvement.[138] Organists and their sons might come from, and join, the upper ranks of civic government.[139]

The musical activities of the church—especially those of the professional musicians and the Latin school choir—were a focus of civic and lordly patronage and often quite intense interest on the part of Lutheran governments. The prestige of these musical institutions helped to ensure their survival and continued support. They were not necessarily, however, theologically "conservative" or confessionally neutral, despite continuity with pre-Reformation civic patronage of religious music.[140] Lutherans were quite capable of selecting from the existing Latin repertoire according to their own theological criteria, as well as of composing new textual and musical material.

Given the linguistic ideals of early-modern pedagogy, as well as the cultural prestige of Latin music, the qualification consistently appearing in Lutheran church- and school-ordinances that the schoolboys might sing in German if they were supporting the singing of the congregation was a major concession. It also meant that the vernacular hymns were the common possession of Lutherans at all levels of education and culture, not only sung by the elite students of the Latin school but also accessible through their oral transmission to the illiterate laity at the opposite end of the educational spectrum. Thus, though the German hymns were not the sole element in Lutheran public worship, they played a key role in unifying the wide-ranging musical endeavors of the Lutheran churches.

Although the Latin school choir attracted the primary interest of educated clergy and town governments, there were also German schools for boys and also for girls.[141] The boys of the German school often formed a choir that took a role in public worship, and girls' choirs may have been more common than published ordinances suggest.[142] All of these helped to support and lead congregational song.

---

[138] Arno Werner, *Vier Jahrhunderte im Dienste der Kirchenmusik: Geschichte des Amtes und Standes der evangelischen Kantoren, Organisten und Stadtpfeifer seit der Reformation* (Leipzig, 1933).

[139] Brown, *Singing the Gospel*, p. 48.

[140] Compare the following descriptions of Lutheran musical life in Nuremberg, Augsburg, and Joachimsthal: Bartlett Butler, *Liturgical Music in 16th-Century Nuremberg: A Social-Musical Study* (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1970); Fisher, *Music and Religious Identity*, pp. 70–84; Brown, *Singing the Gospel*.

[141] Cornelia Niekus Moore, *The Maiden's Mirror: Reading Material for German Girls in the 16th and 17th Centuries* (Wiesbaden, 1987), pp. 141–42.

[142] Examples include Hof, Naumburg (Heinrich Kätzel, *Muzikpflege und Musikerziehung im Reformationsjahrhundert dargestellt am Beispiel der Stadt Hof* [Göttingen, 1957], pp. 89–90),

The public role of school choirs—and the town governments' interest in them—was not confined to the performance of the liturgy, polyphonic motets, and the leading of congregational song. The singing of the choirs regularly spilled outside of the church into the streets, as the students, keeping an old tradition, made their rounds collecting alms (now usually under the close supervision of school personnel) and singing (the *Kurrendengesang*).[143] They also played a key role in more formal processions, not only on scholastic occasions marking the start of the school term, but especially in funerals and other occasions calling for public prayer. In Joachimsthal the schoolchildren exercised themselves in an annual procession in which they symbolically drove the pope from the town by singing a German hymn.[144] Supported by evangelical governments, the public practice of Lutheran music in the schools, churches and streets helped to shape and reinforce Lutheran identity by teaching and modeling evangelical faith, sustaining a common culture of Lutheran song.

Hymnals and the Home

For all the attention paid to the public conduct of singing, the most important context for Lutheran hymns was the home. Among the clearest measures of lay interest and participation in domestic singing is the outpouring of vernacular hymnals from the presses of 16th-century Germany. Between 1520 and 1600 nearly 2000 hymn editions appeared.[145] Depending on the estimate made for average edition size, these represent between two and four million copies in circulation.[146]

Joachimsthal (Brown, *Singing the Gospel*, pp. 64–65), and Seuzach (Moore, *Maiden's Mirror*, p. 148; part of a [Lutheranizing?] attempt to introduce a hymnal in a town attached to Zurich), and likely many more places where the less formal records attesting to the institution of a girls' choir have not yet been searched.

[143] Fisher, *Music and Religious Identity*, pp. 73–74; Brown, *Singing the Gospel*, pp. 72–73.

[144] Ibid., pp. 73–75.

[145] A combined tabulation of editions listed in DKL (979 editions) and those additionally catalogued by Wackernagel, WB, W1–5 and not listed in DKL (1007 editions). The editions in DKL are predominantly hymnals [*Gesangbücher*] (53%), but also broadsheets (16%), theological or devotional materials (especially collections of sermons) including hymns (15%). Proportionately few are publications especially for trained musicians (2%) or agendas containing hymns (2%). See the full classification scheme in DKL, pp. 20–23.

[146] See Brown, *Singing the Gospel*, p. 5; Pettegree, *Reformation and the Culture of Persuasion*, p. 46 favors the higher estimate.

Table 1. *16th-Century Hymn Printing*

Decade	*% Lutheran (DKL L + E)*	*Total Editions (DKL+WB)*
1520–29	93.8%	262
1530–39	82.8%	156
1540–49	96.6%	307
1550–59	87.3%	294
1560–69	88.7%	300
1570–79	84.6%	201
1580–89	75.9%	240
1590–99	71.7%	226
TOTAL	84.3%	1986

The great majority of these, more than seventy-five percent, were Lutheran, rising to almost eighty-five percent if "evangelical" hymnals, primarily those from Strassburg and Frankfurt am Main, are included with the Lutheran numbers.[147]

Very few of these printed editions were intended to meet the needs of cantors, choirs, or other professional musicians, who still favored large-format manuscript volumes for their purposes.[148] Only four percent of the hymn editions were large quarto or folio volumes; the overwhelming majority were octavo size or smaller.[149] Since 16th-century churches did not own quantities of hymnals for distribution to the worshipping congregation, these were pocket editions for personal use.[150]

16th-century printers competed eagerly to capture a share of the hymnal market, adding indices and illustrations and boasting on title-pages of the addition of new hymns. Although the hymnals generally contained the hymns sung in the churches, printers did not limit themselves to the lists in the church orders, another sign that the hymnbooks were intended for domestic rather than public use.[151] The public and private spheres intended for the use of the hymns, clear already in the 1524 *Enchiridion*, were set alongside each other in hymnal prefaces through the rest of the century. As the Lübeck hymnal of 1549 put it, "Men should thank and praise God through Christ, both in the com-

[147] DKL lists 738 "Lutheran" and 87 "Evangelical" editions from 1520–1600.
[148] See Jenny, "Kirchenlied, Gesangbuch und Kirchenmusik," pp. 308–09.
[149] Brown, *Singing the Gospel*, pp. 11–12.
[150] See Jenny, "Kirchenlied, Gesangbuch, und Kirchenmusik," p. 311.
[151] Brown, *Singing the Gospel*, pp. 12–13.

mon assembly of Christians, and also every pious housefather with his children and household should give thanks to God in his house with psalms and songs of praise, to comfort and strengthen himself in faith."[152] Or, as Lucas Osiander wrote in 1569, "God's Word should not only be proclaimed and richly set forth [*getrieben und reichlich fürgetragen*] in sermons and careful exposition of Holy Scripture from the pulpit, but also with Christian hymns and sweet spiritual songs among the people of God in the congregation, and also among Christian fathers and their households". As Osiander continued, "For it is and remains God's Word, whether it is read or sung".[153] Public worship and household song were set in coordinate parallel.

By mid-century hymnals adapted specifically for household devotion began to appear. The most popular of these were the songbooks of the Joachimsthal cantor Nicolaus Herman, versifications of the Sunday gospel pericopes and Old Testament narratives that appeared in more than fifty editions between 1560 and the end of the century.[154] Though nearly all hymnals were printed with an eye to household use, the books that identified themselves specifically with that context distinguished themselves in a number of respects. Some household volumes took advantage of their intended context to offer songs set to "worldly" melodies acknowledged to be inappropriate for the church.[155] Herman's own melodies were based on the patterns of the traditional miners' songs or *Bergreihen*. Others emphasized hymns uniquely appropriate for household activities: hymns upon rising or going to bed (though these were often found in the "standard" hymnals as well), or lullabies for calming infants.[156] Children were supplied with religious songs to be sung while dancing in a ring.[157] The success of these volumes in

[152] WB 1094, pref. 51, p. 589.

[153] Lucas Osiander, WB 907 (Tübingen 1569), pref. 81, p. 639.

[154] Nicolaus Herman, *Die Sontags Evangelia, und von den fürnemsten Festen uber das gantze Jar, In Gesenge gefasset fur Christliche Haussveter und ire Kinder* (Wittenberg, 1560. 1561), repr. *Die Sonntags-Evangelia von Nicolaus Herman*, ed. Rudolf Wolkan (Vienna, 1895), and printed in 33 editions 1560–1600 (Brown, *Singing the Gospel*, pp. 175–77); idem, *Die Historien von der Sindflut, Joseph, Mose, Helia, Elisa, und der Susanna, sampt etlichen Historien aus den Evangelisten, Auch etliche Psalmen und Geistliche Lieder zu lesen und zu singen in Reime gefasset, Für Christliche Hausveter und ire Kinder* (Wittenberg, 1562), printed in 19 editions 1560–1600 (see Brown, *Singing the Gospel*, pp. 179–80).

[155] E.g., Valentin Triller, *Ein Christlich Singebuch* (Breslau, 1559).

[156] W3, nos 1332, 1333.

[157] See Hans-Bruno Ernst, *Zur Geschichte des Kinderlieds: Das einstimmige deutsche geistliche Kinderlied im 16. Jahrhundert* (Regensburg, 1985), pp. 106–37, esp. pp. 132–37.

the press shows the interest of early-modern parents in supplying their families with such songs.

In his preface to Herman's *Sonntags-Evangelia*, Wittenberg superintendent and professor Paul Eber—himself the writer of several hymns for his own children—described the household devotions the book was meant to support as well as their benefit:[158]

> Christian fathers and mothers who hold God's Word dear will be able to manifest their diligence in accustoming their children and servants to the hymns, and singing along with them themselves, and sometimes explaining and expounding one stanza after another. And such household sermons without doubt yield great benefit, so that many simple, unlearned people are able to comfort and encourage themselves more amid distress and temptation with one of these hymns than from a lengthy and carefully arranged sermon.[159]

This remarkable concession of a Lutheran pastor—that the household devotions of parents and children yielded greater fruit than the sermons delivered from the pulpit—was in fact common in the writing and preaching of the Lutheran clergy.[160] It was the Word of God, whether conveyed in the sermon or by the hymns, and not the clerical office, that was the vital point of contact with divine grace and power.

The hymns thus played a key role not only in household religious instruction—sometimes reinforcing the domestic hierarchy, as parents (both mothers and fathers are identified) taught hymns to their children, sometimes reversing it as schoolchildren taught hymns to their parents—and in the rhythms of family devotion, but also in the spiritual care of Christians. Eber claimed that the hymns enabled lay Christians to "comfort, instruct, and greatly encourage themselves and others in time of need, without a clergyman". He himself had been astonished at the ability of Lutheran laity (women in particular) to apply and derive comfort from the hymns they had learned.[161] Even on the deathbed, the Lutheran laywoman was equipped with her own repertoire of

---

[158] W5, pp. 4–6.

[159] Paul Eber, WB 788, pref. 67, p. 609.

[160] Nicolaus Selneccer, *Der gantze Psalter* (Nuremberg, 1569), WB 898, pref. 79, p. 637: "much has been accomplished in the church through fine spiritual songs, and often more thereby than with sermons". David Wolder, *New Catechismus Gesangbüchlein* (Hamburg, 1598), WB 1052, pref. 98, pp. 676–77: "the hymns bear more fruit in awakening the heart to devotion than any number of lengthy sermons and treatises". Cf. Brown, *Singing the Gospel*, pp. 107–10.

[161] Eber, WB 788, pref. 67, p. 609.

song, learned by heart whether from the choir in the church or her own hymnal. And if she were unable to sing for herself, her husband, children, and neighbors stood ready to lend their voices.[162]

The hymnals and the domestic piety they supported were thus central to Lutheran lay identity and independence. Though private devotion shared many of its texts and melodies with the public worship of the congregation, it had its own independent value, founded upon the power of God's Word, on the one hand, and upon the dignity of the household estate, the *status oeconomicus*, on the other. The hymns, used in the home to teach and to comfort, were a key manifestation of the universal Christian priesthood, which—as the Lutheran clergy themselves urged—was not inferior in its capacity to the public ministry of the Word.

Prayer and Prayerbooks in Lutheran Culture

Luther's Prayerbook

Though the vernacular hymnal [*Gesangbuch*] was essentially a Lutheran invention, the prayerbook was well-established as a prominent feature of medieval piety. The fundamental model of prayer for medieval Christians was the monastic liturgy described in the *Rule of St. Benedict*, whose core was the weekly recitation of the entire Psalter, distributed among eight hours of prayer each day. Although new forms of meditative prayer developed in the high Middle Ages, influenced by St. Anselm and the *Meditationes* ascribed to Augustine, the monastic office remained the touchstone of religious devotion in prayer.[163] Luther's own participation in the hours as a monk immersed him in this piety of the Psalms.

Simplified vernacular equivalents of the liturgy of the hours were introduced not only for the secular laity but also for the lay brothers, nuns, and beguines of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Most frequently, these involved repetitions of the Lord's Prayer, and later of

---

[162] Brown, *Singing the Gospel*, pp. 110–12, 127–29.

[163] See *The Prayers and Meditations of Saint Anselm*, trans. Benedicta Ward (Harmondsworth, 1973); on the pseudo-Augustinian *Meditationes*, see Elke Axmacher, *Praxis Evangeliorum: Theologie und Frömmigkeit bei Martin Moller (1547–1606)* (Göttingen, 1989), pp. 112–115.

the *Ave Maria* as well, especially in the Rosary prayer that flourished in Europe from the 14th century onward, often called the *Marienpsalter*, a hundred-and-fifty-fold repetition of the *Ave Maria*.[164] Late medieval prayer was also closely bound up with the penitential system, not only as satisfaction assigned for sin, but also through special promises of indulgence attached to particular prayers. The cycle of prayers attributed to Saint Birgitta of Sweden, for instance, combining the Lord's Prayer and *Ave Maria* with meditations on the Passion, promised indulgence for diligent and devout repetition. By the end of the 14th century the *Hortulus Animae* had united these varied forms of prayer under a single cover, appearing in more than a hundred Latin, German, and other vernacular editions between 1498 and 1523.[165]

Luther's 1522 *Betbüchlein* was categorical in its rejection of the medieval prayerbooks, which, Luther complained, were "not the least" of the means by which Christians had been deceived, with their "manifold wretchedness concerning penance and enumeration of sins, such unchristian foolishness in the prayers to God and his saints… and yet they trumpet themselves with indulgence and red titles with fancy names".[166] Accordingly, Luther wrote, they deserved a "vigorous, thorough reformation"—a critique of "shameful, false, blasphemous prayerbooks" he repeated throughout his life.[167]

Luther's prayerbook was of a radically different character than the medieval prayerbooks it sought to replace.[168] Indeed, it scarcely contained prayer texts, narrowly conceived, at all, restricting itself to biblical texts (including the Creed), and had the character of a catechism as much as a prayerbook.[169] One of Luther's innovations was to regard the catechism itself as a prayer, an identification that Luther

---

[164] E.g., WB 4–6.

[165] See Angela Baumann-Koch, *Frühe lutherische Gebetsliteratur bei Andreas Musculus und Daniel Cramer* (Frankfurt/M, 2001), pp. 442–43 and the literature cited there. Cf. WB 28, 30. For a survey of late medieval prayer and its literature, see Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England 1400–1580* (New Haven, 1992), pp. 209–98 and Stephan Beissel, "Zur Geschichte der Gebetbücher," *Stimmen aus Maria Laach* 77 (1909), 28–41, 169–85, 274–89, 397–411.

[166] The *Betbüchlein* is presented in WA 10,2:375–501, LW 43:3–45.

[167] WA 10,2:375; WA DB 10,2:156–57 (preface to the Neuburg Psalter, 1545); WA 21:201 (preface to Cruciger's Sommerpostil, 1544).

[168] See Martin Brecht, "'Und willst das Beten,'" pp. 275–78.

[169] The difficulty contemporaries had in deciding the genre of the 1522 book is suggested by the title given to the 1524 Basel edition: *Ein bettbuchlin vnd leßbüchlin. Regel Christlichs Wesens*, followed by a listing of the contents, WA 10,2:357–58, edition "S".

continued to emphasize in his later exhortations, especially in his 1535 *Simple Way to Pray*.[170] In its first edition the *Betbüchlin* assembled Luther's 1520 expositions of the Ten Commandments, Apostles' Creed, and the Lord's Prayer along with a new exposition of the Hail Mary and German translations of eight Psalms and the Epistle to Titus.[171] The Commandments, Creed, and Lord's Prayer were intended to instruct a person in "the three things necessary for a man to know in order to be saved:… what he should do and not do… where to find [help] so that he may do and not do this… how to seek and obtain it".[172] The exposition of the Commandments replaced the medieval *Beichtspiegel* with a series of reflections on the transgression of each commandment and its fulfillment. But in the expositions of the Creed and the Lord's Prayer Luther illustrated his fundamental model of prayer: beginning with the brief text itself and then continuing with expanded meditations addressed to God on each article or petition. In his 1535 *Simple Way to Pray*, this pattern was applied to praying the Ten Commandments as well (there presented after the Lord's Prayer rather than first as in Luther's standard catechetical order).

Luther's exposition of the *Ave Maria*, on the other hand, was chiefly a warning against abuse of the text (which, he argued, was an encomium of Mary and no prayer at all), and contrasted those who recited many rosaries but cursed Mary and her son by denying his teaching with those who honored both Mary and her son by praising and believing in Christ.[173] Luther's use of a text drawn solely from Luke 1:28 and 42 was perhaps less surprising to his first readers since the added petition (*sancta Maria, mater Dei, ora pro nobis…*) had come into use only at the beginning of the 16th century.[174] Luther's exposition of the *Ave Maria* continued to be printed in editions of the *Betbüchlein* throughout his lifetime though the last Wittenberg editions identified it explicitly (alone among the coeval pieces) as a piece from 1522, perhaps out of a sense that it had lived out its contemporary relevance.[175]

---

[170] *Eine einfältige Weise zu Beten für einen guten Freund*, WA 38:358–375 (LW 43:187–211); cf Luther's sermons on Ps. 110, WA 41:213 (LW 13:334). See Brecht, "Und willst das Beten," p. 278.

[171] The contents of the editions of the *Betbüchlein* are outlined in WA 10,2:358.

[172] WA 10,2:376.

[173] WA 10,2:408–09.

[174] John Shinners, *Medieval Popular Religion, 1000–1500* (Peterborough, ON, 1997), p. 5.

[175] WA 10,2:407.

Instead of prayers for specific circumstances, Luther provided a selection of psalms with indications of their purpose: Psalm 12, "for the elevation of the holy gospel;" Psalm 67, "for increase of faith;" Psalm 51 "concerning all sin, that is, essential and inherited sin and its fruits;" Psalm 103, "to thank God for all his blessings;" Psalm 20 "for good government and secular authority;" Psalm 79, "against the enemies of the Christian congregation and the gospel;" Psalm 25, "a general prayer of commendation to God in all circumstances;" and Psalm 10 "against the Antichrist and his kingdom".[176] Finally, the first edition of the prayerbook offered the Epistle to Titus to the reader "for instruction in Christian life".

Luther continued to augment the *Betbüchlein*, which appeared in forty-eight editions throughout his lifetime, including Latin editions of 1529 and 1543. After expanding the 1523 edition with more New Testament Epistles, Luther removed all of these in 1525 and added a set of sermons from the Church Postil on prayer, the Passion, Baptism, confession and the Sacrament, and on preparing to die. Beginning with the 1529 Wittenberg edition, Luther added a calendar and the *Passional*—in fact an illustrated summary of the whole Bible, with fifty woodcuts with brief accompanying Scriptural texts depicting Biblical history (at least the Pentateuch and the New Testament) from the creation to the Last Judgment, including, of course, the Passion of Jesus. Between Pentecost and the Last Judgment was an image of a church with preaching, Baptism and the Last Supper. By the 1545 Wittenberg edition of the *Betbüchlein*, the book contained the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds and the Te Deum in addition to the Apostles' Creed of the original book, Luther's 1541 prayer for protection against the Turks, and portions of Luther's 1528 *Great Confession* and his 1539 *On the Councils and the Church* (on the marks of the church). It concluded with Luther's German Litany.[177]

---

[176] For some of the psalms in the *Betbüchlein*, Luther later composed hymns (Ps. 12, Ps. 67; *Luthers geistliche Lieder*, 175–79, 184–87, LW 53: 226–28,234) or included versifications by others (Erhard Hegenwalt's version of Ps. 51, W3, no. 70).

[177] The edition in WA 10,2 makes it considerably easier to see the shape of the 1522 book than it does to reconstruct the 1545 edition. See however WA 10,2:355–369.

The Psalter

Luther further developed the *Betbüchlein*'s preference for biblical prayer texts in his prefaces to the German Psalter, first published in 1524. He called on Christians to use the Psalter itself as their daily prayerbook, along with the Lord's Prayer, and criticized efforts to supplant these with manmade prayers or paraphrases.[178] In 1531 Luther composed brief summaries of each psalm to guide the reader in their interpretation and application and categorized them according to their purpose (prophecy, doctrine, comfort, prayer, or praise); these summaries were printed as an appendix in the separate Wittenberg Psalters from 1533 on.[179] With more than a hundred separate 16th-century editions, the German Psalter was by far the most printed individual book of the German Bible.

Luther prized the Psalter because through exercise in it the twofold divine word and work of Law and Gospel became clear;[180] it was a "school in which faith and a good conscience toward God are learned, exercised, and strengthened"; a "little Bible… in which everything found in the entire Bible is summarized in lovely and brief words"; a book of true examples from the lives of the saints, showing not merely their actions but their heart and words amid every kind of "joy, fear, hope, and sadness," and especially a book clearly showing the Head of the saints, containing "such clear promises of Christ's death and resurrection, and images of the condition and nature of his Kingdom and all Christendom". It is a treasury of words appropriate to every circumstance of the saints: "everything that a devout heart may want to pray, he will find in his psalter".[181] Luther's appreciation of the role of the Psalter in the Christian's life was a matter of understanding it as proclamation as much as petition. He could therefore describe prayer as producing "comfort" as well as "doctrine," the same doublet used to describe the Lutheran hymns.[182]

---

[178] WA DB 10,2:155.
[179] WA 38:18–69.
[180] WA DB 10,1:97 (1524 Psalter preface).
[181] See Luther's preface of 1528, revised in 1545 (WA DB 10,1:98–105; LW 35:253–255), and the 1545 preface to the Neuburg Psalter (WA DB 10,2:155).
[182] WA 10,2:377 ("trostlichem gepett"); WA DB 10,2:155 ("so leret vnd troestet Er auch eben imm Gebet").

Luther's Theology of Prayer[183]

For all the importance that Luther and his followers placed on prayer—especially the Lord's Prayer and the Psalms—they were concerned to make clear that prayer was secondary, a response to the Word rather than a meritorious human initiative. For example, Caspar Güttel's "Offene Beicht," included in many editions of the *Betbüchlein* outside Wittenberg, contained the remarkable confession, "I have busied myself and my understanding, property, honor, and powers, *too much with prayer* and human teaching rather than with the divine Word".[184] Prayer was an exercise of faith in God's promise under the cross, not a means of winning benefits from God.[185]

In the Catechisms, Luther tied prayer and proclamation together around his explanation of the proper use and hallowing of the Name of God in the Second Commandment and the first petition of the Lord's Prayer. God's name was honored both when "the Word of God is taught in its truth and purity" and when Christians "call upon it in every trouble, pray, praise, and give thanks".[186] Or, as he put it in his 1528 sermons on John 16–17, "A good sermon should be followed by a good prayer," the consequence of preaching and hearing the Word of God. "Those who preach, hear, and know the Word of God, but do not pray, intimate that they are still arrogant and secure, as though they were not continually in need of God's grace".[187] Prayer was for Luther a key exercise of faith, not only because it was based upon God's sure promise to hear prayer in Jesus' name, but also because prayer arose out of the temptations [*Anfechtungen*] that tried faith.[188] Indeed, to pray to God out of distress and dire need was the very worship that God desired. Psalm 50:15, "Call upon me in the day of trouble; I will deliver you, and you shall glorify me," was a favorite text of Luther's, describing prayer precisely as the acknowledgement that God "is the

[183] See Martin Brecht, "'Und willst das Beten,'" pp. 268–99; Koch, *Habermann*, pp. 17–132.
[184] WA 10,2:428 (emphasis added). For editions containing the text, see ibid., pp. 366–9.
[185] Cf. Luther's critique of prayer that "nicht zum glauben, sondern zu zeitlichem nutz vnd brauch schentlich gebraucht wirdt," WA DB 10,2:155.
[186] Small Catechism, BSLK, pp. 508, 512; BC, pp. 352, 356.
[187] WA 28:73.
[188] See Brecht, "'Und willst das Beten,'" p. 274.

one from whom we are to expect all good and to which we are to take refuge in all distress".[189]

Because prayer was founded upon God's promise, its effectiveness did not rest upon the worthiness of the one praying.[190] Neither was prayer efficacious simply by virtue of recitation of the words (a charge Luther brought against monastic prayer) but because it arose out of a believing heart.[191] Intercession before God was therefore not the prerogative of a spiritual estate within the church, but a responsibility and privilege belonging to all the baptized.[192]

Luther's critique of merely external prayer was not, however, a rejection of external forms or postures for prayer, which he defended over against the *Schwärmer*. Neither was it a rejection of fixed or exemplary texts, which Luther insisted were all but essential to keep the mind from wandering astray.[193] If the *Betbüchlein* had originally confined itself to biblical texts, Luther elsewhere provided other models for prayer that also helped to shape Lutheran practice.

Prayer outside the Betbüchlein *and Psalter*

What Luther's contemporaries judged to be conspicuously missing from the *Betbüchlein* were collections of short prayers for particular occasions, purposes or intentions, and printers elsewhere often added such material to their editions of Luther's prayerbook. Luther's Small Catechism, on the other hand, contained models for morning, evening, and table prayers, and some editions of the *Betbüchlein* published away from Wittenberg likewise included these.[194]

Luther also began the process of adapting Latin liturgical prayer (the collects) for lay vernacular use. These appeared appended to hymns in the Wittenberg hymnals and their imitators elsewhere; they also found their way into the Lutheran agendas and church orders, which

---

[189] Large Catechism, (Second commandment, ¶ 64; First Commandment, ¶ 1) BSLK, pp. 576, 560; BC, pp. 394, 386).

[190] Brecht, "'Und willst das Beten,'" p. 285; see Luther's *Kurtzer Trostzettel für die Christen, daß sie im Gebet sich nicht irren lassen*, WA 51:455–56.

[191] Koch, *Habermann*, pp. 30–31; Large Catechism, Lord's Prayer §119–120.

[192] *De instituendis ministris* (1523), WA 12:186–87, LW 40:30; sermons on 1 Peter (1522/1523), WA 12:308–09, LW 30:52; sermons on Ps. 110 (1535/1539), WA 41:213, LW 13:334.

[193] WA 28:74–78.

[194] BSLK, pp. 521–523 (BC, pp. 363–64); cf. Brecht, "'Und willst das Beten,'" pp. 280–81.

almost universally prescribed that the collects should be read or sung in German.[195]

Luther's German version of the Litany became the staple of public prayer in Lutheran churches, replacing (often in combination with hymns such as Paul Eber's *Wenn wir in höchsten Nöten sein*) the processions and votive masses of the medieval church in times of public emergency.[196] The incorporation of the Litany in the 1545 Wittenberg *Betbüchlein* bridged the gap between public and private intercession, as did Luther's prayer against the Turkish invasion, itself a free expansion of the first petitions of the Lord's Prayer.[197] In a reversal of medieval patterns in which the laity had imitated the structures of monastic practice using simplified texts, Lutheran devotion shared texts between public and private prayer while developing structures suited to each context.

Luther also composed a handful of prayers for particular persons and circumstances which, already in his lifetime and especially after his death saw wider publication. To these, editors added prayers adapted out of passages from Luther's writings (especially from the postil sermons) and published them as separate prayerbooks.[198] Some of these prayers, even *spuria* such as the prayer attributed to Luther on the way to the Diet of Worms, became treasured parts of Lutheran devotion.[199]

---

[195] WA 35, *passim*; WA 30.3:35–36, LW 53:131–46. Though Althaus, *Forschungen*, p. 11, characterizes Luther's collects as primarily liturgical, their publication in the hymnals demonstrates that Luther had private use in mind as well. See Jenny, "Kirchenlied," p. 305.

[196] The German Litany in *Luthers geistliche Lieder*: 250–63, LW 53:163–70; cf. WA 10,2:368. For Eber's hymn, see W4, no. 6. On the popular use of the litany, see P.J. Broadhead, "Public Worship, Liturgy, and the Introduction of the Lutheran Reformation in the Territorial Lands of Nuremberg," *English Historical Review* 120 (2005), 277–302.

[197] WA 51:607–10, incorporated into the Wittenberg *Betbüchlein* from 1542 (WA 10,2:368).

[198] See Frieder Schulz, *Die Gebete Luthers: Edition, Bibliographie und Wirkungsgeschichte* (Gütersloh, 1976); Robert Kolb, *Martin Luther as Prophet, Teacher, and Hero: Images of the Reformer, 1520–1620* (Grand Rapids, 1999), pp. 170–72; and Althaus, *Forschungen*, pp. 12–13; cf. Brecht, "'Und willst das Beten,'" pp. 287–88.

[199] E.g., Luther's "chancel prayer," adapted from the Genesis lectures, WA 43:519; see Schulz, *Gebet*, no. 515. For the "prayer on the way to Worms," see WA 35:212–14; Schulz, *Gebet*, p. 150 no. 37, pp. 262–63 no. 437.

Lutheran Prayerbooks after Luther

Luther's students and the following generation drew not only on the *Betbüchlein* but especially on the other models for prayer found in Luther. Some of them also turned to pre-Reformation prayers and contemporary Roman Catholic writers as models and sources, a development described and criticized by the elder Paul Althaus in his influential monograph.[200] But one may fairly question whether a turn to medieval and Jesuit sources was the main current of development in Lutheran prayer after 1550, or only a side-stream, at least before Johann Arndt's monumental *Paradiesgärtlein* of 1612.[201]

Luther's presentation of collects for private use was continued by writers of prayers closely tied to the ecclesiastical calendar. Jacob Otter's 1537 *Bettbüchlein für allerley gemeyn anligen der Kirchen* offered collects for private use derived from Otter's public prayers and the Sunday gospels.[202] Veit Dietrich's 1546 series of collects on the gospels carried on this tradition and became widely popular, especially as incorporated into other prayerbooks and postils.[203] They formed a parallel in prayer to Nicolaus Herman's popular series of hymns on the Sunday gospels, with which Dietrich's collects were occasionally printed.[204]

Among the prayerbooks incorporating Dietrich's gospel prayers alongside a complete translation of the Sunday collects was the collection by the Mansfeld court-preacher Michael Coelius, published in multiple editions under varying titles beginning about 1550.[205] To these Coelius appended prayers "to be said daily by each according to his estate," that is, prayers of pastors, parishioners, magistrates, subjects, and the members of the household.

The Joachimsthal preacher Johann Mathesius offered his *Schöne und Christliche gebeine Gebetlein* of 1563, which combined new collects for the Sundays and festivals of the church year with prayers "*für allerley noth der Christenheit*," that is, prayers to be said for or by Christians in various estates, callings, and circumstances. His *Kurtze Hauß Gebetlein*, appended

---

[200] Althaus, *Forschungen*, pp. 59–66, 142.

[201] For criticism of Althaus' thesis, see Koch, *Habermann*, p. 180, n. 79.

[202] Althaus, *Forschungen*, pp. 46–48.

[203] Ibid., pp. 55–56.

[204] DKL 1580 06: *Summaria vnd Gesäng Auff alle Sontag vnd fürnemste Fest durchs Jar/ sampt darzu gehörenden schönen Gebettlein/ Für Christliche Haußvätter/ jre Kinder vnd Gesind*… (Frankfurt/M., 1580).

[205] Althaus, *Forschungen*, pp. 56–59; Koch, *Habermann*, pp. 200–08.

to the German edition of his popular *Oeconomia*, offered prayers to be said by members of the household in different circumstances.[206] Mathesius' household prayers were incorporated in Caspar Melissander's *Ehebüchlein*, a popular gift for Lutheran couples.[207]

These prayerbooks, with their prayers for different members of the family, especially emphasized the household as the context for prayer. Also widespread were prayerbooks for the sick and dying and those who attended them.[208] Like the hymns written for the deathbed, these prayerbooks undergirded lay self-sufficiency at the moment when, according to medieval practice, the presence of clergy had been most essential.

Melanchthon, too, was influential as a model for prayer in the Wittenberg tradition.[209] Wittenberg professor Georg Major issued the first of many editions of his *Psalterium Davidis*, including ecclesiastical hymns and collects, in 1547.[210] Melanchthon's patristic interests were most extensively reflected in Andreas Musculus' 1553 *Precandi Formulae* (revised in German in 1559), consisting primarily of meditations gathered from the church fathers.[211] Musculus' intention was to attest the continuity of Lutheran teaching and piety with the early church.[212] His use of earlier materials was selective; he rejected the German mystics altogether, for example, and his use of medieval texts, apart from the pseudo-Augustinian *Meditationes*, which he may have regarded as genuine, is extremely limited. His selection and presentation of these texts is oriented toward Evangelical themes of the believer's certainty of grace

---

[206] See Loesche, *Mathesius* 2,:390–395, 401–402; Althaus, *Forschungen*, pp. 56, n. 1, 213.

[207] Caspar Melissander [Bienemann], *Christliches Ehebüchlein für mannbare Gesellen und Junckfrauen* (Leipzig, 1585). VD16 B5427–B5431, ZV18626, ZV21336. Cf. Steven Ozment, *Flesh and Spirit: Private Life in Early Modern Germany* (New York, 1999), pp. 19, 278, n. 110.

[208] Althaus, *Forschungen*, pp. 37–40, 48–51, 105–06, 108–09, 128–29, 134.

[209] Martin H. Jung, *Frömmigkeit und Theologie bei Philipp Melanchthon. Das Gebet im Leben und in der Lehre des Reformators* (Tübingen, 1998).

[210] Georg Major, *Psalterium Davidis* (Magdeburg, 1547), VD16 ZV1638, ZV1676, B3183, ZV1691, ZV1693, ZV1695, ZV1700, ZV15043, ZV3735, ZV25395, ZV1727.

[211] Ibid., pp. 98–103; Baumann-Koch, *Gebetsliteratur*.

[212] See Robert Kolb, "'The Fathers in the Service of Lutheran Teaching: Andreas Musculus' Use of Patristic Sources," in *Auctoritas patrum II: Neue Beitrage zur Rezeption der Kirchenväter im 15. und 16. Jahrhundert*, ed. Leif Grane et al. (Mainz, 1998), pp. 105–23.

through faith, on the one hand, and the working out of faith in love toward the neighbor on the other. At the same time, however, these pre-Reformation texts, even after Musculus' selection, did not always unambiguously reflect Lutheran teaching; the Lutheran character of Musculus' prayerbook is clearer in the German translation than in the Latin original.[213]

More extensive use of medieval material as well as of contemporary Roman Catholic prayer was made by Ludwig Rabus, who turned his collector's enthusiasm to prayer in his two-volume *Christlichs Bettbüchlin* of 1565 and 1568.[214] Martin Moller's 1584 *Meditationes sanctorum patrum* continued the adaptation of the pseudo-Augustinian *Meditationes* for Lutheran prayer; in the 17th century, the new fashion in prayerbooks was ushered in by Johann Gerhard's 1606 *Meditationes sacrae* and above all by Johann Arndt's 1612 *Paradiesgärtlein*.[215] Not all of these later authors shared Musculus' concern with theological discrimination within the body of pre-Reformation literature; Arndt, in particular, can be said to have reinterpreted Luther through the lens of late medieval mysticism rather than to have used Luther's criteria as a touchstone for evaluation.

Johann Habermann's Christliche Gebete

Nonetheless, for the later 16th century such prayerbooks were not the main or most influential form of development. By far the most popular and enduring of the Lutheran prayerbooks was Johann Habermann's *Christliche Gebette für allerley Not und Stende der gantzen Christenheit*, published at Wittenberg in 1567, though no copy of the *editio princeps* survives, not unusual for *Gebrauchsliteratur* such as prayerbooks and hymnals.[216] At least

---

[213] Baumann-Koch, *Gebetsliteratur*, pp. 412–15, 429–34.

[214] Althaus, *Forschungen*, pp. 109–16; on Rabus and his similarly encyclopedic *Historien der Martyrer*, see Robert Kolb, *For All the Saints: Changing Perceptions of Martyrdom and Sainthood in the Lutheran Reformation* (Macon, GA, 1987), pp. 41–83.

[215] Althaus, *Forschungen*, pp. 134–35, 152–53. On Moller, see Axmacher, *Praxis*. On 17th-century prayer literature in general, see Bernhard Vogler, "Die Gebetbücher in der lutherischen Orthodoxie (1550–1700)," in Hans-Christoph Rublack, ed., *Die lutherische Konfessionalisierung in Deutschland*… (Gütersloh, 1992), pp. 424–34.

[216] Koch, *Habermann*, lists editions of the prayerbook pp. 149–59. Habermann's prayerbook is cited here from the 1572 Wittenberg edition: *Christliche Gebet, auff alle Tag in der Wochen zu sprechen* (Wittenberg, 1572), except for his preface, which is cited from

59 editions appeared by 1600, including fifteen in Latin translation and some in verse. In certain early editions, Habermann's book acquired the simplified title of *Betbüchlein*, by which it came to be generally known. Its publication continued unabated through the following centuries alongside the newer prayerbooks of Arndt and others, its possession recognized as a mark of Lutheran identity.[217]

Habermann offered his readers a cycle of eight prayers for each day of the week, followed by a selection of "prayers for individuals in all estates". The prayers for each day included morning and evening prayers, a thanksgiving, two petitions, two intercessions, and a prayer for protection. These were intended to supplement rather than replace the praying of the Lord's Prayer, Creed, and Ten Commandments in the morning and the evening.[218] In their form Habermann's prayers were an expansion, often to several pages, of the liturgical collect.[219] Habermann thus reinforced Luther's presentation of translated collects for lay use in the Wittenberg hymnals as a typical Lutheran form.[220] Though Habermann's prayerbook was intended for private use (and the individual prayers extended to liturgically indecent lengths), its prayers were in content, objectivity, and tone similar to the prayers used in public worship.[221]

Though Habermann could point to Lutheran precedents, he was sensitive to the charge of having departed from the *Betbüchlein*'s original standard of exclusively Biblical prayer. He sought to weave his prayers as much as possible from Biblical strands, especially the Psalms. As Habermann put it, "I have particularly striven to draw the words as

---

the 1631 Lüneburg edition: *Christliche Gebet, für alle Noth und Stande der gantzen Christenheit ausgetheilet, Auf alle Tage in der Wochen zu sprechen* (Lüneburg, 1631), both from microfiche held by the Thrivent Reformation Research Program, St. Paul, Minnesota from exemplars held by the Herzog August Bibliothek, Wolfenbüttel. A critical edition of Habermann's prayerbook is being prepared by Johann Anselm Steiger of the Institut für Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte of the University of Hamburg.

[217] See Koch, *Habermann*, pp. 149–59, listing 48 editions during Habermann's lifetime, to which the following may be added from VD 16: H17–22, H24, H26, H27, H29–32, H34–38, ZV07184, ZV07186, ZV07187, ZV07189, ZV07191, ZV07201, ZV07202, ZV07205, ZV07206, ZV11722, ZV17561, ZV21217, ZV22312. On Habermann's prayerbook as a confessional marker and its ongoing reception, see ibid., pp. 173–76. Althaus discusses Habermann in *Forschungen*, pp. 119–26.

[218] Koch, *Habermann*, pp. 182, n. 84, 185, n. 93.

[219] Ibid., p. 209.

[220] Ibid., p. 202, referring to the model given Habermann by Coelius.

[221] Ibid., pp. 185–87.

much as possible from Holy Scripture, so that we might become accustomed to them and make them our own [*sie uns gemein machen*]. And of ourselves we will neither find nor invent any better or more powerful words than the ones used by the holy prophets, apostles, and men of God by inspiration of the Holy Spirit".[222]

Habermann's prayerbook owed as much to Luther's Small Catechism as to the *Betbüchlein*. It was the Catechism that offered a model of morning and evening prayer for the individual Christian, and Habermann's prayers occasionally echoed the Catechism and its prayers.[223] The sacramental emphases of the Catechism were recalled in a selection of prayers before and after the Supper, though private confession was not in view (a confessional prayer was included) and baptism, curiously, played only a small role in Habermann's prayers.[224]

The prayerbook as a whole was Habermann's working out of the Small Catechism's *Haustafel*, or "Table of Responsibilities," in the form of prayer.[225] Again, in his 1544 Postil preface Luther had praised the new Evangelical understanding of the estates and callings as one of the chief fruits of the reform.[226] Habermann was not the first Lutheran to organize prayer according to the estates and callings of life in the world, but the wide popularity of Habermann's *Christliche Gebete* cemented this approach to prayer in Lutheran consciousness.

Habermann's intended Christian audience was widely inclusive, at least insofar as households had at least one member capable of reading the prayers (their length and structure make them far less likely candidates for memorization than the hymns). Though he announced in his preface that he had composed the prayerbook especially "for the benefit of the simple," he included prayers to be said by magistrates as well as subjects, wives as well as husbands, parents as well as children,

---

[222] Habermann, *Gebete* (1631), fol. A5a; cf. Althaus's judgment, *Forschungen*, p. 121: "die eingefügten Bibelsprüche… wachsen organisch aus den Gebeten hervor und leihen dem Ausdruck, was des Beters eigene Worte nur unzulänglich widerzugeben vermöchten". See also Koch, *Habermann*, pp. 20–210.

[223] Ibid., pp. 190–91.

[224] Habermann, *Gebete* (1578), fols. Aa4a-5a (general confession); Aa 5b–Bb 7b (prayers before and after the supper). One of the few mentions of Baptism is in the confession: "[ich] hab also den Bund meiner heiligen Tauff ubergangen" (fol. Aa4a–b).

[225] BSLK, pp. 423–527, BC, pp. 365–67.

[226] WA 28:200.

servants as well as masters, pastors as well as laity.[227] The interests of women, in particular, were represented, reflected in the original dedications to the countess Anna Schlick and then to the princess Dorothea of Saxony; the book remained a popular piece of devotional literature among Lutheran women.[228]

But more determinative of the character of the book, perhaps, than the assortment of prayers in the second half of the book that were intended to be prayed *by* Christians in various conditions and circumstances, was Habermann's insistence—reflected in the weekly cycle of prayers in the first half of his book—that "every Christian throughout the week should pray *for* the various estates and conditions of humanity, presenting his own burdens *and those of his neighbors* to God in prayer".[229] Habermann's prayerbook enacted the priesthood of the baptized as they confidently came before God in their homes to pray for their neighbors and the world.

The subjects for prayer proposed by Habermann in the weekly cycle were balanced between spiritual and temporal concerns—echoing the Litany as well as the *Haustafel*—and drew the Christian deep into the life of his neighbor and society. The *Betbüchlein* was thus scarcely individualistic or exclusively otherworldly in its focus.[230] Though Habermann regarded himself as living in "these last, perilous times," his response in the prayerbook was to intensify prayer for the world and the estates God had established to order and sustain it until the Last Day.[231]

---

[227] Habermann, *Gebete* (1631), fol. A4b; cf Koch, *Habermann*, pp. 185–86.

[228] Cornelia Niekus Moore, *Maiden's Mirror*, pp. 79–80; cf. Koch, *Johann Habermann*, pp. 145, 154.

[229] Habermann, *Gebete* (1631), fol. A4b (emphasis added); cf. Koch, *Habermann*, p. 191.

[230] Cf. Althaus, *Forschungen*, p. 59; Vogler, "Gebetbücher," p. 430.

[231] Habermann, *Gebete* (1631), fol. A4b; see also the 1574 preface, cited in Koch, *Habermann*, p. 178.

Table 1. *Daily Prayers in Habermann's* Christliche Gebete[232]

	Thanksgiving	*Petition 1*	*Petition 2*	*Intercession 1*	*Intercession 2*	*Prayer against*
Su	Creation	forgiveness of sins	preservation of the Church	preachers	hearers of the Word	false doctrine & sects
M	Redemption	faith & knowledge	Kingdom of God	secular authority	subjects	enemies of Christendom
T	Sanctification	steadfast hope	Christian humility	Christian married people	Christian youth	the kingdom of Satan
W	knowledge of Christ	genuine love	fruits of the earth	mortal sinners	the sick	temptations of the devil
Th	preservation of the body	unity of faith	temporal peace	the unbelieving & deceived	benefactors	temptations of the world
F	suffering of Christ	genuine repentance	patience amid suffering	pregnant women	captives	temptations of the flesh
Sa	mercy of God	a blessed end	daily bread	those troubled & tempted	widows	doubt & fear

[232] Adapted from the presentation in ibid., p. 199.

Among the chief religious concerns of the prayerbook was the preservation of pure doctrine, above all in the heart of the Christian, but also in the church (defined as "the little flock, the poor herd, of those who honor and put forth [*fördern*] the Word that by Your grace they have received").[233] In the prayers, the responsibility for remaining steadfast in the Word is assigned to each praying Christian, under God's grace, as is responsibility for avoiding false prophets and judging doctrine according to God's Word.[234] Indeed, outside of the prayers for magistrates and subjects, the role of the prince and secular authority is not mentioned. The early English translator of Habermann's prayerbook noticed this omission and inserted before the weekly prayers a "dailie praier for the perpetual happiness of our sacred, and most gratious Sovereigne and Queene Elizabeth".[235] But in Habermann's own prayers for secular authority, the religious responsibility of Christian government is described rather minimally as "protecting us in the pure doctrine of the gospel".[236] The duties of the Christian prince to enforce the first table of the law are not articulated in Habermann. Instead, the prayerbook emphasizes the role of the lay Christian, who prays for faithful pastors and for Christian government but also prays for wisdom and strength to endure faithful without these. Not only the clear organization of Habermann's prayerbook, with its systematic distribution of household prayer over the course of the week, but also its respect for the role of the Lutheran laity contributed to its enduring popular reception.

Despite Althaus' thesis that Habermann's prayerbook was derivative of the Jesuit Peter Michaelis' *Serta Honoris*, Habermann's work seems instead to have been a remarkably independent production, a Lutheran book quite different in character from the works of Musculus or Rabus.[237] Indeed, the very possibility of Habermann's dependence on the *Serta* is questionable, resting on the existence of a lost 1561 edition whose attestation in a catalogue more likely rests on a false transcription of the date than on the prodigious appearance of a first edition when its author was only nineteen years old. The parallels in texts and organization to which Althaus points, moreover, either vanish on

---

[233] Habermann, *Gebete* (1578), fol. B6b.

[234] Ibid., fols. C6a, C8a: "auff das dein Wort unser einig Richtscheidt und messchnur sey/darnach wir alle Lere urteilen/und von den frembden fliehen".

[235] *The Enemie of Securitie*, tr. Thomas Rogers (London, 1586), pp. 7–11.

[236] Habermann, *Gebete* (1578), fol. E5b.

[237] Althaus, *Forschungen*, pp. 91–96, 122–26.

closer inspection or had been anticipated in earlier Lutheran literature (Michael Coelius' organization of prayers for the various estates, for example).[238] Habermann's prayerbook—and its continuing publication and popularity in later centuries—thus stands against the thesis that Lutheran prayer in the latter 16th century was overwhelmed by the influences of late medieval mysticism and Jesuit spirituality.

In prayer as in many other genres, the Jesuits may rather have been capable appropriators and adapters of Lutheran innovations. Indeed, despite the existence of pre-Reformation vernacular prayerbooks, early Protestants seem to have taken an early lead in this field of vernacular literature, albeit a more temporary one than in the field of vernacular hymnals. The 1551 vernacular prayerbook prepared by the Franciscan Johann Wild, for example, drew more than half of its prayers from Protestant sources.[239] Catholic vernacular prayerbooks remained comparatively scarce until the 17th century.[240]

Lutheran Prayer-book Printing

The total production of 16th-century Lutheran prayerbooks has not been so exhaustively catalogued as that of the hymnals, but a very preliminary census can be offered. Althaus' study notes 250 Evangelical prayerbook editions through 1600, to which at least 59 additional editions of Habermann and 64 of Luther's *Betbüchlein* may be added,[241] a rough total of 373 Lutheran prayer-book editions in the 16th century. Though this tabulation could likely be at least doubled by further bibliographic research, it seems unlikely that prayerbooks approached half of the volume of hymnal printing in the same period. They were thus an important though secondary resource for Lutheran piety.

Together, prayerbook and hymnal, alongside the postil and catechism, provided the foundation for Lutheran piety within the household. These books had clear connections to the public worship and teaching of the evangelical church, but equally at home among the parents, children, and servants of the household as among the pastors and Latin students

---

[238] See the detailed and convincing analysis by Koch, *Habermann*, pp. 371–412.
[239] Althaus, *Forschungen*, pp. 80–82.
[240] Beissel, "Geschichte," p. 397, cited in Moore, *Maiden's Mirror*, p. 84.
[241] Luther's *Betbüchlein*: see Benzing 1273–1318; VD16 L4081–L4125, ZV9968, ZV9970, ZV10039, ZV10068, ZV10075, ZV17413, ZV22822, and WA 10,2:355–62, with further references in WA 59:72–74, 74–76.

of the church. The household was not a secondary locus for prayer and the singing of God's Word, but coequal with the church; not in opposition to public worship but the essential complement to and, in case of need, substitute for it.

For the ordering of household devotion, the laity seem to have preferred the clearly structured books of Herman or Habermann to the looser encyclopedic agglomerations of prayers or hymns. Traugott Koch describes Habermann's prayerbook as mediating between the spiritual "independence" of the laity, on the one hand, and their practical "uncertainty" about how to exercise their prerogatives on the other.[242] The Lutheran clergy, the primary authors of this devotional literature, who sought to address lay uncertainty by providing clear models for devotion, were also committed to upholding lay spiritual independence.

Piety and Persecution

This household devotion became a bulwark for Lutheran faith amid the rapidly shifting political and religious currents of early-modern Germany, a key to Lutheran survival amid increasing pressure from Calvinists and Roman Catholics in the late 16th and first half of the 17th century. Examples from across Germany attest the role of Lutheran song and household piety amid the Second Reformation and Thirty Years' War.

When German princes sought to introduce Calvinism into their territories—under the Saxon elector Christian I (ruled 1586–1591) and especially in Brandenburg under Johann Sigisimund beginning in 1613—among the signal changes of the confessional move was the abolition of Luther's hymnal in favor of the German translation of the Genevan Psalter prepared by Königsberg jurist Ambrosius Lobwasser.[243] Lutherans quickly attacked the Lobwasser psalter on both musical (its melodies and rhythms were foreign and unfamiliar) and theological grounds. In part, Lutheran opposition was a matter of implication; as Polycarp Leyser wrote, "when the music in the temples is changed, the teaching is changed as well; that is, when people sing in a new

[242] Koch, *Habermann*, p. 179.

[243] Ambrosius Lobwasser, *Der Psalter des Königlichen Propheten Davids, In deutsche reymen verstendlich und deutlich gebracht*… (Leipzig, 1573). A selection of texts is presented in Wackernagel, *Kirchenlied* 4:844–57.

and foreign manner in the churches, a transformation of the doctrine generally follows".[244]

But the Calvinist psalter and the Lutheran hymns were not mere party markers; rather, they reflected fundamentally different exegetical approaches.[245] What was ultimately at stake for popular piety in the contest over public song in the churches of Brandenburg was the evangelical character of what was sung: were the psalms sung by the people in the church proclamations of Jesus Christ that could provide direct comfort to the Christian's heart, or were they historical pieces describing God's dealings with another people under a different covenant, whose application to the Christian was not evident and could only be arrived at through learned exegetical gymnastics? A comparison of Luther's metrical setting of Psalm 46 (*Ein feste Burg ist unser Gott*) and its direct identification of Jesus as Lord of Sabaoth with the strictly literal translation of the Genevan psalm demonstrates how different the two standards were. Repeatedly, Lutheran congregations resisted the imposition of the new pattern of song, either by refusing to sing, by singing the old Lutheran hymn appropriate to the day instead, or even by riot and violence.[246]

Where Lutheran populations came under Roman Catholic rule, the Lutheran hymns also became the focus of public resistance as well as of private devotion. Remarkably similar stories emerge from across Counter-Reformation Germany describing lay responses to the expulsion of Lutheran clergy and attempts to impose Roman Catholicism by mandate. In such circumstances the basic form of Lutheran religious practice was the piety of the home. When the Augsburg Lutheran clergy were expelled in 1584 for their refusal to accept the new papal (Gregorian) calendar, Georg Müller wrote to his congregation,

> In the meantime you should assemble yourselves together at arranged times with your children and domestics, consult your collections of sermons and

[244] Cornelius Becker, *Der Psalter Davids Gesangweis, Auff die in Lutherischen Kirchen gewöhnliche Melodeyen zugerichtet* (Leipzig, 1602). See Wackernagel, *Kirchenlied* 5:361–410. The prefaces of Becker and Polycarp Leyser are printed in WB 1060, pref. 100, pp. 679–84.

[245] For the broader Lutheran charge of "Judaizing" against Calvinist exegesis, see Aegidius Hunnius, *Calvinus Iudaizans* (Frankfurt/M., 1595).

[246] Bodo Nischan, *Prince, People, and Confession: The Second Reformation in Brandenburg* (Philadelphia, 1994), pp. 151–53. On Lutheran congregational insistence on the *de tempore* hymns, see Herl, *Worship Wars*, pp. 155–56.

> other pure books, [let] the word [of God] live richly among you, and let your prayers and singing of psalms sound out in consolation.[247]

His advice was echoed by the exiled clergy of Joachimsthal in 1623.[248] For their part, the authorities charged with enforcing recatholicization found the Lutheran laity doing much as Müller and his fellow pastors had hoped, meeting in their homes to pray, read, and sing. When summoned before authorities, the fathers of households protested that they had been reading for themselves alone and could not be blamed if others had decided to listen as well.[249] Despite efforts at monitoring private activity and relatively severe punishments (an Augsburg cloth-cutter was imprisoned for eight days, half on bread and water, for "having read, prayed, and sung with his children in his house") the authorities recognized that their efforts to extirpate domestic Lutheranism by force were all but doomed to failure.[250]

The Lutheran laity also expressed their public opposition to the Counter-Reformation by means of song. Though a ban on public use of Lutheran song was among the first steps taken by the authorities, the people of Augsburg sang Lutheran hymns and pointed adaptations thereof in the streets and taverns.[251] In the village of Bergrheinfeld, in the diocese of Würzburg, the people made clear their rejection of the Gregorian calendar by singing the Lutheran hymns *de tempore* appropriate to the liturgical season according to the old Julian calendar.[252] In Joachimsthal and Bergrheinfeld Lutheran lay resistance to Catholicization continued, at least at home, for decades after the expulsion of evangelical clergy and the imposition of official Roman Catholicism.[253]

Such Lutheran popular devotion to the hymns, revealed under persecution, was not necessarily the product of ideal or exceptional preparation and instruction in the previous decades. In Brandenburg the Lutheran liturgical order in force before the Second Reformation was one of the most conservative in Germany, with little public role for

---

[247] Quoted and translated in Fisher, *Music and Religious Identity*, pp. 27–28.
[248] Brown, *Singing the Gospel*, p. 137.
[249] Ibid., p. 139; Fisher, *Music and Religious Identity*, pp. 283–84.
[250] Ibid., p. 285; Brown, *Singing the Gospel*, p. 139.
[251] Fisher, *Music and Religious Identity*, pp. 27–70, 80–281; cf. Ludwig Weiss, "Reformation und Gegenreformation in Bergrheinfeld," *Würzburger Diözesangeschichtsblätter* 43 (1981), 307.
[252] Weiss, "Reformation und Gegenreformation in Bergrheinfeld," pp. 300–01.
[253] Ibid., pp. 331–41; Brown, *Singing the Gospel*, pp. 145–49.

congregational song as compared with the Saxon church order. None of the major centers of 16th-century hymnal-printing was located in Brandenburg. In Augsburg the public music of Lutheranism had been given minimal confessional color during forty years of leadership by the internationally minded cantor Adam Gumpelzhaimer.[254] The impulse toward Lutheran song came instead from the pastors and the hymnals they edited for household use, and was readily received by the tradesmen and craftsmen who sang the hymns and penned their own *contrafacta*.[255] The village of Bergrheinfeld was no Lutheran metropolis; its pastors were obscure and its public institutions limited to the church and a German school. What was revealed, in each case, as official support for Lutheranism was removed, was a lay appropriation of the hymns and other forms of Lutheran domestic piety in which the laity themselves, who had learned the hymns and bought the prayerbooks and hymnals, had been the primary agents.

Luther and his students had understood the piety of the household in the context of the last days of the world. In what his students hailed as prophecy in Luther's preface to Daniel, he had warned that "the world shall become so thoroughly Epicurean that there will be no more public preaching in the whole world, and nothing but Epicurean abomination shall be spoken of in public, and the gospel will be preserved only in homes by fathers".[256] Committed to a homely piety of the Word, in which (for example) the prophecy that "your sons and daughters shall prophesy" was fulfilled by children reciting the Catechism around the family table, Lutheran pastors, cantors, and lay writers sought to preserve the gospel they believed had been graciously restored to light in the last days of the world, not only by preaching sermons, writing church orders, establishing consistories, and organizing schools, but especially by composing hymnals, prayerbooks and other supports for the religious life of the household.[257]

The literature of Lutheran devotion is thus rich in paradox. It attests the development of a confessional identity not simply in accord with the

---

[254] Fisher, *Music and Religious Identity*, pp. 71–84.

[255] Especially the work of Augsburg preacher Gregor Sunderreiter, overlooked in Fisher's study: WB 956 (= VD16 H3445), WB 962, DKL 1581 09, WB 994, VD16 H3444; cf. Fisher, pp. 27–28 on the exiled preacher Georg Müller.

[256] WA DB 11.2, p. 123. Cf. Johann Mathesius, *Postilla/Oder außlegung der Sontags Euangelien uber das gantze jar* (Nuremberg, 1565), 1:65a; Cyriacus Spangenberg, *Cithara Lutheri*, WB 963, preface 92, p. 654. See Brown, *Singing the Gospel*, pp. 171–72.

[257] Johann Mathesius, *Postilla Prophetica* (Leipzig, 1589), 1:165b.

demands of the early-modern state for uniformity, but also, potentially, in opposition to them. It is a preparation for life amid the estates of the world arising out a deep sense of the fragility of those estates in the face of increasing diabolical assault. And nevertheless these prayers and hymns, written with a keen sense of the approaching end, have proved among the most enduring products of the 16th-century Reformation.

THE PULPIT AND THE PEW: SHAPING POPULAR PIETY IN THE LATE REFORMATION

Robert Christman

Asked twenty-five years ago to evaluate the state of scholarship on the Late Reformation in Germany, one historian described it as a "virtual wasteland" but also "a land of golden opportunity".[1] Since then many scholars have responded to the call, but opportunities remain, particularly in the study of the interaction between the ideas of the reformers and the beliefs and behavior of the laity. This article summarizes the work already done on this topic and synthesizes it with significant primary source research. Much of this study examines the issue from the perspective of the Lutheran churchmen who endeavored to shape the piety of their parishioners during the period 1550 to 1619. One goal of the article is to sketch the system they created, which was characterized by augmenting, refining, tailoring, and defining their expectations for the laity as well as the methods by which they would inculcate in them proper Lutheran belief and behavior. A second goal is to shed some light on the responses of the people in the pews to the teachings, admonitions, and disciplinary measures introduced by the clerics.

If piety is, as Robert Scribner defines it, "the attempt in daily life to consistently live one's beliefs,"[2] we can refine the notion further to distinguish between "popular piety" and "parishioner piety". Parishioner piety refers to the ways in which the laity understands (or misunderstands), accepts, rejects, and transforms the guidance it receives from

I am grateful to the *Herzog August Bibliothek* for a generous grant and comprehensive technical assistance provided for research on this project. I also owe a debt of gratitude to C. Scott Dixon and Daniel Rosenberg for their helpful comments on drafts of this article.

[1] James M. Kittelson, "The Confessional Age: The Late Reformation in Germany," in *Reformation Europe: A Guide to Research*, ed. Steven Ozment (St. Louis, 1982), pp. 361–81, here at p. 361.

[2] "…einen Versuch, den Glauben des einzelnen im alltäglichen Leben consequent durchzusetzen". Robert Scribner, "Volksglaube und Volksfrömmigkeit. Begriffe und Historiographie," in *Volksfrömmigkeit in der Frühen Neuzeit. Katholisches Leben und Kirchenreform im Zeitalter der Glaubensspaltung*, ed. Hansgeorg Molitor and Heribert Smolinsky (Münster, 1994), pp. 121–38, here at p. 121.

clerical elites (assessed under goal number two). Popular piety, however, "reache[s] far beyond the officially sanctioned practices of the church and include[s] much that ecclesiastical authorities would have considered superstition".[3] This is piety from the perspective of the folk, who may or may not be sitting in the church pew on Sunday morning. A third goal of this article is to provide a general assessment of what is known about it for the German-speaking Lutheran lands during this period.

To achieve these goals the article is divided into three sections. The first sketches the Lutheran vision of the actions, attitudes, and behaviors appropriate to each Christian. The churchmen's understanding of faith properly lived goes beyond mere expectations for participation in church-related or devotional activities to encompass all aspects of thought, word, and action.

Section two examines the methods employed by the Lutheran ecclesiastics. It describes their educational strategies, explores the various official points of contact between the church and laity, and addresses the diverse means by which the pastors attempted to enforce their vision of a godly society—a vision that increasingly became a basis for cooperation between the church and state. But to what degree were the clerics able to implement their programs? What were the points of clearest cooperation or fiercest resistance? Such questions are notoriously difficult to answer, but the fact that regulations on proper Christian behavior are repeated so frequently requires that these questions be considered.

Section three shifts the focus from the prescriptions of the churchmen to descriptions of popular beliefs, religious practices, and behavior, many of which fall outside those officially sanctioned by the church. This investigation poses significant problems, for first-hand accounts of popular beliefs and religious practices are rare, and the populace constantly accepted, rejected, transformed, and influenced official positions and practices. This is popular piety on its own terms, an area of research that is expanding and promises to provide an increasingly nuanced picture, not of what people were supposed to believe and how they were expected to act, but of the realities of the situation.

[3] "…reichte weit über die offizielle und zugebilligte Praxis der Kirche hinaus und schloβ vieles ein, das kirchliche Instanzen als Aberglauben (*superstitio*) abwerteten," ibid., p. 121.

The Clerical Vision of a Godly Life

In 1614 a Lutheran pastor named Sebastian Artomedes preached a series of twenty-five sermons devoted to each estate (*Stand*) and calling (*Beruf* or *Vocatio*) outlined in Luther's *Haustafel* (*Table of Duties*). He began with a short parable designed to explain the origin of the estates: shortly after the fall into sin, Adam was working in the field, and Eve was home minding the house, when God approached. Eve quickly cleaned up and made the children presentable. Upon God's arrival Abel and Seth were in a respectable state. Cain, however, was still dirty from his work in the fields, so Eve hid him in a pile of hay. God took Abel and Seth on his knee and asked them to recite their confessions. With Seth nodding assent, Abel declared that he believed in the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, who, since the fall into sin, had promised a Savior to crush the head of the serpent. This serpent-crusher, continued Abel, is my consolation, through whom I hope to achieve eternal life. Abel then asked God to send his Spirit so that he might model his life according to the Divine's wishes. God was greatly pleased with the two children. He then asked after Cain, who, to his mother's horror, was fetched from the hay pile, dirty, with hair strewn with hay, and asked to recite his confession. Cain said that he believed in a God in heaven who sends good weather and food when humans diligently performed their offerings, but he did not know anything about this serpent-crusher, or the forgiveness of sins. As for eternal life, he had serious doubts and would find out when he died. Angrily God responded, "You are a farmer, and you will remain a farmer, and you and your type will be subject to your two brothers".[4] God made the descendants of Abel priests and teachers; the descendants of Seth, kings and rulers; but the descendants of Cain remained farmers and workers. Thus, God established the three estates.

Most Lutheran clerics who wrote and preached on the *Haustafel* did not create such complex stories to explain its origins. Luther himself merely listed each estate and calling that he considered divinely ordained

[4] "du bist ein Bawer und bleibest ein Bawer/ unnd du mit deiner Gesellschaft solt deinen zweyen Brüder unterworffen seyn". Sebastian Artomedes, *Christliche Auslegung und Erklerung der Hausztafel/ wie sich all drey Stände/ der Lehr/ Wehr und Nehrstand/ Das ist/ das Predigampt/ Oberkeit/ Hausvätter und Hausmütter/ auch alle die jenigen/ so diesen Ständen oder Orden zugethan und verwandt sein/ Christlich in ihrem Ampte nach Gottes Befehl verhalten sollen* (Leipzig, 1614), p. 35.

and scripturally verifiable, along with a few Bible passages describing the proper behavior for its members.[5] But a few pages long and without commentary, he included this catalog at the end of his *Small Catechism*, coining the term *Haustafel* to describe it,[6] apparently intending that it to be posted in every house, as a reminder of each person's duties to God and neighbor. Contemporaries also saw it as Luther's attempt to provide a unified conclusion to his catechism—a vision of the practical application of the law and gospel articulated in the preceding pages.[7]

To the degree that Luther's *Small Catechism* was circulated, taught, and used as the basis of efforts to educate the masses, so was the *Haustafel.* Although assigned a lower status than the five chief articles of the catechism, it received far more attention from contemporaries than it has from modern scholarship. Various churchmen repackaged it, transposing it into rhymed couplets,[8] or stanzas with an accompanying melody.[9] Many expanded on it in sermon cycles,[10] or explained it in

---

[5] Most passages come from the epistles of St. Paul and include Col. 3:18–4,1; Eph. 5:22–6,9; 1 Tim. 2:18–15 and 6:1–2; Tit. 2:1–10; 1 Pet. 2:13–3,7.

[6] Most scholars agree that the *Haustafel* was an original composition by Luther. Albrecht Peters, *Kommentar zu Luthers Katechismen*, 5 vols., ed. Gottfried Seebaß (Göttingen, 1994), 5:104.

[7] Several early modern authors describe the *Haustafel* as such. Aegidius Hunnius writes that while the catechism articulates the articles of the Christian religion in distilled form, "[d]ie Haußtafel aber gehet etwas näher herbey/ zeiget unterschiedlich/ *in specie*, und in sonderheit einem jeden in seinem Beruff/ was ihme in denselbigen zuthun gebüren oder nicht gebüren wölle". *Christliche Haußtafel/ Das ist: Beschreibung allerley Stände und Orden der Christen/ Als da sind: Lehrer/ Zuhörer/ Obrigkeiten/ Untertanen/ Eheleut/ Eltern/ Kinder/ Knechte und Mägde/ Herren und Frawen/ gemeine Jugendt/ Wittwen und dann ins gemein alle Menschen was jedem in seinem Beruff und Standt zuthun oder zulassen gebüre* (Frankfurt/M, 1586), *Vorrede*, p. III. Having reached the *Haustafel* in his sermon series on the Catechism, Artomedes writes, "da es nun zur praxi kömmet/ und man recht lernet uben und gebrauchen/ was man aus den ersten zweyen Stücken/ aus den zehen Geboten und dem Christlichen Glauben gelernet". *Christliche Auslegung*, p. 1.

[8] Johann Holtheuser, *Haustaffel: Darinnen aller menschen Empter, in was Christlichem stand sie sind, kürtzlich und ordentlich in Deutsche Reimen verfasset, begriffen*…(Erfurt, 1556).

[9] Nicolaus Herman, *Die Haustafel/ darinn eim jeden angezeigt wird/ wie er sich in seinem stand verhalten sol. Inn ein gesang gefasset/ zu singen oder zu lesen/ Lieblich und lüstig* (Wittenberg, 1562).

[10] Cyriacus Spangenberg, *Die geistliche Haustafel: Wie sich ein jeglicher*…*Mensch in seinem Stande und beruff nach Gottes willen rechtschaffen halten solle* (Wittenberg, 1556); Hieronymus Weller, *Haußtafel außgelegt: das ist Ein schön christlich Büchlein von geystlichem, weltlichem und Haußregiment* (Nuremberg, 1556); Heinrich Salmuth, *Christliche und Nützliche Erklerung der Haußtaffel/ Darinnen von den dreyen Stenden/ sampt andern zugehorenden/ gehandelt wird* (Leipzig, 1584); Johann Arndt, *Außlegung des gantzen Psalters Davids des Königlichen Propheten/ In 2 Theile abgefasset*…*Item: Der Catechismus*…*nebenst der Haußtaffel*…*In*…*Predigten*…*begriffen* (Lüneburg, 1666 [1616]).

commentaries on the catechism.[11] As such, *Haustafel* literature provides an official Lutheran vision of lived religion or piety in its broadest sense, one with which inhabitants of Lutheran lands would have had some experience.

Those churchmen who used Luther's *Haustafel* as their point of departure divided all of society into three estates:[12] the spiritual estate, which consisted of those who in some official capacity proclaimed God's Word (distinguished by a call initiated through official channels and according to the customs of the land),[13] and all those who heard it (*Zuhörer*); the ruling estate, which included temporal authorities established and ordained by God, and their subjects; and the household, which made up the remainder of callings—those of husbands, wives, parents, children, masters and mistresses, servants and laborers, the youth, widows, teachers and students, and all Christians in general. The assumption was that God called each individual to a certain station in life, and some to more than one simultaneously. A man might be a husband, master, parent, subject, and parishioner. The role of the Christian was to accept his or her calling, and fulfill the duties appropriate to it as described in the *Haustafel*.

Clerics commenting on the *Haustafel* generally characterized the callings of individuals in positions of authority (clerics, rulers, husbands, parents, masters and mistresses, and schoolteachers) as having a parental relationship with their charges: rulers were told to have a father's heart, loving their subjects as children; masters and mistresses were to treat those in their care as they would their own offspring; and teachers were reminded that they took the place of a father.

---

[11] For example, Johan Spangenberg, *Des Kleinen Catechismi und der Haustaffel kurtzer begriff, wie man sie in der Gemein zu Halle für die Kinder handelt* (Leipzig, 1553).

[12] Multiple authors also mention estates that they view as false human inventions, referring most often to orders of monks and nuns. Cyriacus Spangenberg calls them a creation of the pope, who apes God in an attempt to establish new estates. *Geistliche Haustafel*, p. 6. Salmuth suggests that members of the monastic orders, because their estates are false, cannot expect God to answer their prayers for help in fulfilling them. *Christliche Erklerung*, p. 18.

[13] Normally bishops, pastors, preachers and sometimes professors and schoolmasters. Hunnius insists that in addition to an official call, each pastor must be educated, not like the Anabaptists who preached without having formally studied the Scriptures. For, he insists, "…nicht ein jeder in dritten Himmel gezuckt wirdt," *Christliche Haußtafel*, p. 8. Artomedes likewise applies a special status to those individuals with a call, insisting that they are "…Legaten und Botschafften an Christi statt…Haußhalter uber Gottes Geheimnes/ das ist/ uber Gottes Wort und Sacramenta". *Christliche Auslegung*, p. 44.

Spiritual responsibilities toward their charges comprised an essential duty of those in authority. Not surprisingly, pastors were to preach God's Word, console the penitent, administer the sacraments, hear confession, give absolution, and pray for all estates. But rulers also had spiritual duties toward God (to acknowledge him as their own Lord, keep his commandments, and pray for wisdom) and toward their subjects (to ensure that God's Word was taught in truth and purity, establish churches and schools, and expunge idolatry from their lands). Husbands were to teach their wives good morals. A parent's spiritual duties commenced with having children baptized and included instruction in good morals, the catechism,[14] and prayer, coupled with regular church attendance. Masters and mistresses were to admonish their charges to go to church, receive the sacraments, learn the catechism, and practice good morals.[15] Schoolteachers were expected to teach students the word and service of God.

After spiritual matters, commentators on the *Haustafel* ranked attention to the temporal needs of those in their care as the authorities' next duty. Rulers were warned not to overtax their subjects but to help them through difficult times. Husbands were told that if they loved their wives and families, they would provide for their needs rather than wasting earnings on drink and gambling or worse yet, abandoning wife and children altogether.[16] Masters and mistresses were expected to pay their servants an honorable wage, feed them decently, not overwork them, and care for them when sick.[17]

Disciplining their charges was another key function of all those in authority. Pastors were to admonish evildoers with equity and maintain control over their own wives and children. Rulers were to punish evil and judge according to standards of justice, not social status. As the head of the wife, it was the husband's role to reprove her when

---

[14] Holtheuser insists that a parent's most important responsibility was to teach the child the catechism. For, he asks, "Was können nu auf Erd die eltern reich/ Den Kindern lassen/ diesen gütern gleich?" Holtheuser, *Haustaffel*, p. 18.

[15] Salmuth refers to households as small churches or chapels, *Christliche Erklerung*, 263; Hunnius asserts that both the master and the mistress of the house should be house preachers (*Hausprediger*). *Christliche Haußtafel*, p. 125.

[16] Holtheuser puts it rather elegantly: "Ein Eheman sol gedüldig sein/ sein Weib nicht halten wie ein Schwein," *Haustafel*, p. 127; however, multiple authors also warn against spoiling a child with fancy clothes and delicate foods, indulgences that Salmuth claims made them weak and lazy. *Christliche und Nützliche Erklerung*, p. 237.

[17] Hunnius describes penurious masters simply: "Wer dem Arbeiter seinen Lohn nicht gibt/ der ist ein Bluthundt". *Christliche Haußtafel*, p. 127.

she sinned. Parents and schoolteachers were encouraged to use the rod on the stiff-necked but always take a measured approach in their punishments.

Finally, concluded the clerical commentators, each individual in a position of authority was expected to set an example of proper Christian behavior for those under his or her care. Pastors' lives were to be spotless, for as Cyriacus Spangenberg argued, if one's own hand is dirty, it cannot very well wash another's.[18] They should be sober; chaste in gestures, words, and deeds, well mannered and slow to anger. Rulers were not to engage in idolatry, blasphemy, gluttony, or drunkenness. The lives of parents, masters and mistresses, and schoolteachers were to be beyond reproach.

Individuals called to be under those in authority (parishioners, subjects, wives, children, servants and laborers, and students) were told by the churchmen to show their superiors the reverence and obedience due a parent. Not surprisingly, children's obligations included honoring, serving, and obeying their parents, praying for and thanking God for them, and speaking well of them to others. But parishioners also owed their pastors childlike obedience,[19] honor, love, and respect, and were expected to pray for and defend their clerics, and overlook their faults. Servants, workers, and day laborers were to obey and honor their masters as parents, not only complying with their commands outwardly, but inwardly in thought, word, and deed. Subjects were to love, pray for, speak well of, and defend their temporal authorities. The youth were told to address the elderly in a friendly manner, stand in their presence, nod, bow, or remove their hat to them, and help them in their weakness.

Spiritual duties of those under authority were manifold and specific. Parishioners were to pay attention during the sermons, realizing that their pastor spoke in place of God, and model their lives on his Word. They failed in their spiritual duties when they did not regularly attend church or were unfriendly toward their pastor. Children were to be especially responsive to parental suggestions to learn God's Word, go to church, remain chaste, and not associate with undesirable people, while students were expected to willingly go to church, diligently learn

[18] Cyriacus Spangenberg, *Geistliche Haustafel*, p. 26.

[19] Various authors emphasize the parent/child nature of this relationship. Salmuth, for example, indicates that parishioners should submit to their pastors "mit kindlichen gehorsam". *Christliche Erklerung*, p. 86.

their catechisms, gladly hear God's word, and pray that he bless their studies.

Closely related to the spiritual duties of individuals under authority, claimed commentators on the *Haustafel*, was the manner in which they were to accept discipline. Wives were expected to be obedient to their husbands, realizing that they had been divinely placed in a position of authority. Parishioners and children were to allow themselves to be punished when they sinned, realizing the benefits they received from it.[20] The young were called upon to obey the elderly, recognizing that God blessed them with long lives to provide an example for others.

Within the general contours of obligations for all stations in the *Haustafel*, each individual calling included a myriad of unique duties and expectations elaborated to various degrees by different clerical commentators. For example, the churchmen expected widows to put their trust in God, believing that he would not only save them from sin but would provide for their bodily needs in the stead of a husband. Husbands were not to despise their wives' advice,[21] while wives were expected to be chaste in body and thrifty in spending habits, and not stop and chat when on business outside the home. Subjects were to obey, fear, and honor their authorities, whether they were godly or not,[22] which meant paying taxes without complaint, following laws, and thanking God that he provided an estate to protect and order the land.[23] Children were not to become engaged without parental consent but were to care for their parents in their old age. And the list goes on.

Designed as an explanation of proper thoughts, words, and deeds for each Christian, *Haustafel* literature provides an excellent overview of the Lutheran churchmen's paradigm of a godly society in which individuals lived their faith. One point that had wide implications

---

[20] Hunnius suggests that despising a pastor and bristling at his punishment is like failing to be thankful to someone who saves you from a deep, dark forest, a flood, or a fire. *Christliche Haußtafel*, p. 21.

[21] Cyriacus Spangenberg makes this point emphatically by suggesting that Pontius Pilate would have been better off had he heeded the advice of his wife. *Geistliche Haustafel*, p. 107.

[22] Many of the authors comment regarding obedience to an ungodly temporal authority. Spangenberg notes that they should be obeyed in all temporal matters, but that no Christian should go against the Word of God or conscience, ibid., p. 4.

[23] Cyriacus Spangenberg describes at great length the chaos that would ensue if there were no temporal authorities to keep external order, citing the adage, "Wo Frösche sind da müssen auch Störche sein" ibid., p. 70.

for the Lutheran vision of parishioner piety was the clear distinction between the clerics and the parishioners.[24] Each author emphasized the point that the defining characteristic of a true pastor was his official call. Parishioners were urged to respect, obey, love, and support the individual who received such a call and not treat him casually, as a drinking buddy (*Zechbruder*), for example.[25] Although those individuals called to be parents, masters, or mistresses were still responsible for teaching the Scriptures and catechism in the home, much of the stress was placed upon ensuring that their charges attend church and school, so that those with an official calling to preach and teach could carry out their responsibilities. Outside the home, parents, masters, and mistresses became *Zuhörern.*

At the heart of the Lutheran vision of parishioner piety was the general idea of calling, which functioned as the practical application of the doctrine of justification by faith. A summation of the catechism, the *Haustafel* represented the day-to-day fruits of the law and gospel properly lived. Most of the behaviors prescribed therein were not unique to Lutheranism. New, however, was the reason for acting according to them. Fulfilling the obligations outlined in the *Haustafel* was not associated directly with achieving heavenly reward, which would have been considered works righteousness. Rather, one lived a proper Christian life to fulfill a divine calling, one that had placed each Christian in an office, within an estate, themselves products of divine ordination.

As the 16th century wore on, authors of *Haustafel* literature accentuated the fact that failure to fulfill one's calling brought God's temporal and eternal wrath, success his blessings, as Luther had indicated in the preface to the Small Catechism. Old Testament examples of both came to be cited with increasing frequency. Those who despised preachers and God's Word were reminded of the story of the flood as well as the fates of Sodom and Gomorrah and Dathan and Abyram. Parents were told to teach their children as the patriarchs in the Old Testament

---

[24] It is interesting that all of the authors of the *Haustafel* literature use the term *Zuhörer* (which means literally "listener") rather than *Pfarrkinder* (which means "the pastor's children") to describe parishioners, reflecting Luther's conviction that the sermon functions as God's delivery of his grace to those who hear. The term *Zuhörer*, by virtue of the fact that it assigns an entirely passive role to the parishioners, could express an even sharper divide between pastors and laity than *Pfarrkinder* might—because a child is merely an adult in training, but a listener remains a listener.

[25] Ibid., pp. 50–51.

had. Those who failed to raise their children well were reminded of the example of the priest Eli, whose evil sons caused his premature death, while parents who did raise their children properly were promised joy and someone to care for them in their old age. Children who refused parental discipline were warned that eventually the executioner would correct them.[26] All were told to work hard in their calling, for to do so would ensure that one had enough to eat, and possibly even become rich. The lazy, however, would be punished with poverty and suffering. Thus, the concept of calling attached real, specific, and obligatory actions to the doctrine of justification by faith. To fail in one's calling was to go against divine will, which had concrete temporal and eternal consequences—a third important concept in the *Haustafel*.

Official Attempts to Shape Parishioner Piety

To develop their parishioners' lives of faith as outlined in the *Haustafel*, Lutheran clerics expanded upon existing church practice and created new forms of instruction during the period between 1550 and 1619. They implemented a multifaceted program to educate the laity, strengthen and confirm their faith via a series of sacraments and rites, and compel them to adhere to official beliefs and sanctioned behavior, an effort in which the state played an increasing role, particularly as a coercive force.[27] Clerical/lay interactions took a pedagogical character, and churchmen increasingly tailored their message to particular social groups. Using the prescriptive edicts found in the territorial church

[26] Ibid., p. 159.

[27] Growing church/state collaboration is an important component of the confessionalization paradigm that describes the process by which the various confessions established their own identities. Confessionalization, writes Heinz Schilling, "designates the fragmentation of the unitary Christendom (*Christianitas Latina*) of the Middle Ages into at least three confessional churches—Lutheran, Calvinistic or "Reformed", and post-tridentine Roman Catholic. Each formed a highly organized system, which tended to monopolize the worldview with respect to the individual, the state, and society, and which laid down strictly formulated norms in politics and morals". Schilling, "The Reformation and the Rise of the Early Modern State," in *Luther and the Modern State in Germany*, ed. James D. Tracy (Kirksville, MO, 1986), pp. 21–30, here p. 22. To the degree that the following section of this article demonstrates the process of confessionalization, it focuses almost exclusively on the perspectives and goals of the church.

ordinances,[28] primarily those from North Germany,[29] supplemented by a burgeoning secondary literature, this section outlines the official points of contact between Lutheran clerics and the laity, and briefly assesses how the laity responded to each facet of the churchmen's program.

[28] These ordinances (*Kirchenordnungen*) were church constitutions established in each autonomous German Lutheran territory. Luther believed that although church structure and practice ought to accord with the gospel, they were not divinely ordained or scripturally dictated. As a result, much variation occurred among territories. Nonetheless, it is possible to sketch the general outlines of German Lutheran church praxis during the period in question. Efforts to produce church ordinances began in the 1520s, accelerated during the 1530s and early 1540s, but tapered off during the tumultuous years surrounding the Schmalkald War. In the decades after the Peace of Augsburg (1555), a new generation of churchmen produced church ordinances, focused not so much on establishing church practice, but expanding, refining, and improving it. Most of the ordinances from the period are significantly enlarged versions of earlier ones. For more on the creation and purpose of church ordinances during this period, see Jeffery Jaynes, "'Ordo et libertas': Church discipline and the makers of the church order in 16th century North Germany" (Ph.D. dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1993), particularly chapter 3; and Anneliese Sprenger-Ruppenthal, *Gesammelte Aufsätze zu den Kirchenordnungen des 16. Jahrhunderts* (Tübingen, 2004). Protestant church ordinances may be found in *Die evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des XVI. Jahrhunderts*, ed. Emil Sehling (various cities, 1902–1977). James Estes has edited and translated into English parts of the Württemburg church ordinance of 1559. See *Godly Magistrates and Church Order: Johannes Brenz and the Establishment of the Lutheran Territorial Church in Germany 1524–1559* (Toronto, 2001), pp. 163–219.

[29] The following overview is a synthesis of information found in the following ordinances: *Kirchenordnung und ceremonien, wie es in ubung gottes worts reichung der hochwirdigen sacrament in den kirchen des herzogthums Preussen sol gehalten werden. 1568*, *Kirchenordnungen*, 4:72–106; *Des fürstenthumes Anhalt policei und landes ordenung* 1572, ibid., 2:570–74; *Grafschaft Oldenburg: Kirchenordnung 1573—Das ander teil, nemlich die agenda oder kirchenordnung wie es mit dem ceremonien sol gehalten werden*, ibid., 7.2.1:1084–1161; *Die Mark Brandenburg Visitations- und consistorial ordnunge von 1573*, ibid., 3:105–41; *Des durchlauchstigsten, hochgebornen fürsten und herrn, herrn Augusten, herzogen zu Sachsen u.s.w. Ordnung, wie es in seiner churf. g. landen bei den kirchen mit der lehr und ceremonien, desgleichen in derselben beiden universiteten, consistorien, fürsten und partikular schulen, visitation, synodis und was solchem allem mehr gehalten werden sol. 1580*, ibid., 1:359–457; *Kirchen-agenda, darinnen tauf, einsegen, und traubüchlein, communion, sampt den teglichen collecten, welche in der kirchen gebraucht werden. Für die prediger der Grafschaft Mansfeld.* 1580, ibid., 2:215–48; *Das Erzbistum Magdeburg, Consistorial-Ordnung. Entwurf, 1580*, ibid., 2:414–17; *Des durchlauchtigen hochgebornen fürsten und herrn, Herrn Georg Ernsten, graven und herrn zu Henneburg, etc. kirchen ordnung wie es in s.f.g. fürstlicher graf- und herrschaft, beide mit lehr und ceremonien, christlich, und gottes wort ebenmessig, gehalten werden sol.* 1582, ibid., 2:298–324; *Der Stadt Erfurt ernuerte Policei und andere Ordnung* 1583, ibid., 2:370–75; *Das Herzogthum Preussen. Consistorialordnung* 1584, ibid., 4:123–50; *Gräflich mansfeldische geistliche consistorial ordnung, aus bewegenden und richtigen ursachen aus deme im druck anno 1560 publicierten patent aufs neue repetiret, auch in etlichen puncten verbessert und gemehret, Anno 1586*, ibid., 2:197–215; *Hertzog Joachim Frederichs zu Leignitz und Brieg etc. Briegsch Kirchenordnung*, 1592, ibid., 3:444–48; *Städte und Ortschaften der Grafschaft Henneberg*, ibid., 2:329–58.

Education

Central to their efforts at education was the church service itself. Already prior to the Reformation preaching services had become popular, a trend intensified by Luther's insistence that each layperson come into direct contact with the Scriptures. As a result, over the course of the 16th century church services became increasingly pedagogical in nature[30] as Lutheran clerics designed various services for precise purposes and specific groups in early modern society.

In most territories Sunday services began with early matins designated for the "simple, poor house servants," whose duties prohibited them from attending the main service.[31] Especially in the villages the focus of this service was always the half-hour explication of a section of the catechism. Pastors were to explain successive sections of the catechism, one per week beginning with each of the Ten Commandments, and concluding with each calling within the *Haustafel*, before beginning the cycle again.

The main service followed, in which a sermon on the gospel lesson served as the center point. Church officials insisted that the standard pericopes be used so that the people would become familiar with these passages, and housefathers would have an easier time explaining them to their families. In the cities with Latin schools, much of the liturgy was still performed in Latin.[32] In the villages services were held entirely in German for the sake of the simple and unlearned, and pastors were told not to preach for more than one hour.[33]

Most German Lutheran territories held Sunday afternoon children's services, essentially catechism classes in which the pastor explained a portion of the catechism and quizzed the children on their ability to recite its articles. Some larger cities also held a second Sunday afternoon

---

[30] Paul Graff, *Geschichte der Auflösung der alten gottesdienstlichen Formen in der evangelischen Kirche Deutschlands bis zum Eintritt der Aufklärung und des Rationalismus* (Göttingen, 1921), p. 110.

[31] "Diese Zeit und predigen sind für das einfeltige arme hausgesinde verordenet, welche zu der hochmesse (wie man es heist) nicht kommen könden, sondern müssen in Küchen und keller zusehen". Sehling, *Kirchenordnungen*, 4:78.

[32] In fact, the Latin liturgy became increasingly common as the century wore on. Susan C. Karant-Nunn, *The Reformation of Ritual: An Interpretation of Early Modern Germany* (London, 1997), p. 119.

[33] It seems that pastors adhered to this stipulation. Georg Planck, pastor of the village of Dinstleben, Thuringia, wrote that when the sand had run through the hour-glass, he quickly concluded by recapping the main points of his sermon so that his parishioners might easier remember them. Sehling, *Kirchenordnungen*, 2:331.

service in which the epistle lesson served as the sermon text. Churchmen, backed by that authority of the state, expected all inhabitants of a territory to attend Sunday services, particularly those designed for their social group, with fines and jail time as penalties for absence.

Weekday services were likewise prescribed, but their frequency and nature varied considerably among territories. Some territories established morning matins, others evening vespers, with services held most often on Wednesdays and Fridays, and sometimes Tuesdays as well. Saturday afternoon vespers, conceived of as a penitential service prior to confession and designed especially for those who intended to receive communion the next day, became nearly ubiquitous. Some territories also instituted weekday common prayer services, in which the Litany was the focus. The people were admonished to come, and when the housefathers were unavailable, they were urged to send a child or servant "to ask dear God for grace, help, and consolation along with the rest of the congregation in these difficult, troubled times".[34]

Festival days, although not as numerous as in Catholic lands, remained frequent. High festivals included Christmas, New Year (sometimes called "The circumcision of Christ"), Epiphany, the presentation of Christ in the temple, the Annunciation to Mary or Conception of Christ,[35] Maundy Thursday, Good Friday, Easter Sunday, Ascension, Pentecost, and Trinity. Services followed the Sunday schedule, often with added church decoration and musical fanfare, especially in the cities.[36] Minor festivals included ten apostles' days, the celebrations of the conversions of St. Paul and Mary Magdalene, and the festival of John the Baptist. Sermons on festival days were to address the history of the events being commemorated, with a didactic emphasis on how the story demonstrated particular points of the Christian faith and catechism.[37]

---

[34] "…den lieben gott um gnade, hülf und trost anzurufen mit dem ganzen haufen, sonderlichen in dieser geschwinden, schweren, betrübten zeit," ibid., 4:80.

[35] On the Protestant use and understanding of the Marian festivals see Beth Kreitzer, *Reforming Mary: Changing Images of the Virgin Mary in the Lutheran Sermons of the 16th Century* (Oxford, 2004).

[36] Graff, *Geschichte der Auflösung*, p. 114.

[37] The authors of the Prussian ordinance claimed that festivals were celebrated to illustrate pertinent points of the second and third articles, listing each festival and the specific doctrinal point it established, K*irchenordnungen*, 4:86.

With regard to their implementation, the reality of the situation often differed from the prescriptions in the ordinances.[38] In the cities, under the watchful eye of church officials, ordinances were followed rather closely, but in the villages there was much deviation. There church officials complained that pastors were canceling the Sunday matins service and ordered that it be reinstated. They noted that in places where a pastor had more than one church, some congregations did not receive a weekly sermon. Moreover, pastors were warned not to call off weekday services which, claimed the authors of the ordinances, they did for the most insignificant reasons.[39]

A second question is whether parishioners actually attended services, and once there, paid attention. It became a staple exhortation in the ordinances that pastors admonish their parishioners to come to church and threaten punishment for failure to do so, although enforcement of such threats varied dramatically. Many, visitors reported, decided to use the time to work, relax, go walking, or while away the morning in the tavern. Authorities further complained that some of those who did attend the services wandered about the church during the hymns and sermon and engaged in all sorts of improper behavior. Others noted that only schoolchildren, present to lead the singing, attended weekday services.

Modern attempts to estimate church attendance offer mixed results. The complaints articulated in the church ordinances were often reflected in the ecclesiastical visitation records, where it was noted that a variety of activities drew parishioners away from church. Some lay people came late and left early or remained in the courtyard and never bothered to

[38] Evidence regarding the execution of the strictures found in the church ordinances is slight and contradictory. By the late 16th century ecclesiastical visitors inevitably asked whether pastors followed ordinances and in 1574, Saxon visitors noted that in many places, churches did not even have a copy. "Bericht der Visitatoren des Kurkreises über die Kirchenvisitationen 1574," in *Die Registraturen der Kirchenvisitationen im ehemals sächsischen Kurkreise*, ed. Karl Pallas, 41,1 (Halle, 1906), pp. 100–109, here at p. 103. However, many of the Thuringian pastors who responded to church officials' requests to submit reports on church praxis in their congregations mentioned that they precisely followed the protocols in the ordinance, *Kirchenordnungen*, 2:329–58.

[39] Cancellation of these services was acceptable only in times when intensive field work was necessary. One Thuringian pastor admits to not preaching on weekdays from St. John's Day (June 24) until St. Bartholomew's day (August 23) because the people were all out in the fields. However, if it rained and they could not work, he explained, he continued with his sermons, *Kirchenordnungen*, 2:333.

go in to the service.[40] In Württemburg the second Sunday afternoon service and many weekday services slowly fell into disuse, often because people needed to work at those times. Nonetheless, moderate and even good levels of attendance were achieved at the main Sunday morning service.[41] Church attendance in Saxony and North Germany quickly shrank to Sundays and festivals, but was quite high on those days, and few clerics there complained, while in the Rhineland participation in services did not meet the officials' expectations.[42] All told, however, there seems to have been a slow increase in church attendance during this period.[43]

The document central to the task of teaching the laity the basics of Lutheran doctrine and behavior was Luther's Small Catechism (1529), considered by the churchmen to be the "sum of all Christian teaching".[44] Many church ordinances insisted that only Luther's be used and that pastors take every opportunity to ensure that their charges memorized it.[45]

As noted above, the catechism played a significant role in various church services. In some territories pastors were also told to read the entire catechism, with morning, evening, and table prayers during the main service, so that the simple folk and parents could learn and teach it to their children. Churchmen also set aside a certain time of the year for more rigorous catechetical examinations. During Sunday afternoon services in Lent, all children in Electoral Saxony were to be tested. Cities were divided into quarters, each sending its children for examination on one Sunday. Officials acknowledged that such examinations caused great anxiety, so they did everything possible to mitigate apprehension. Pastors were ordered to use a fatherly tone and carry out the examinations one by one, away from the waiting crowd so as not to embarrass a child in front of peers. Parents were encouraged

---

[40] Peter Thaddäus Lang, "'Ein Grobes, Unbändiges Volk.' Visitationsberichte und Volksfrömmigkeit," in *Volksfrömmigkeit*, Molitor and Smolinsky, eds., pp. 49–63, here at p. 54.

[41] Bruce Tolley, *Pastors and Parishioners in Württemburg during the Late Reformation 1581–1621* (Stanford, 1995), pp. 74–75.

[42] Bernard Vogler, "Volksfrömmigkeit im Lutherthum Deutschsprachiger Länder," in *Volksfrömmigkeit*, pp. 37–48, here at p. 38.

[43] Vogler, "Volksfrömmigkeit," p. 37; Lang, "Ein Grobes, Unbändiges Volk," p. 54.

[44] Johan Spangenberg, *Des kleinen Catechismi*, Vorrede p. iii; *Kirchenordnungen*, 1:423.

[45] Most church ordinances merely refer to "the Catechism". Saxony's ordinance expressly prohibits the use of catechisms other than Luther's Small Catechism, as does Henneburg's. *Kirchenordnungen*, 1:423 and 2:305.

to attend so that they might know how well their children did and be better prepared to help them learn.[46] Upon the child's first communion, the pastor was especially rigorous in his examination to ensure that the confirmand understood the faith.[47]

Having mastered their catechisms, young Lutherans could expect periodic examinations designed to ensure that they remembered their lessons. Betrothed couples and baptismal sponsors were examined. In the villages of Prussia pastors were told to quiz a few parishioners every five or six weeks.[48] Church and state officials who carried out parish visitations regularly examined young and old alike with regard to their knowledge of the catechism.

Evidence regarding the impact of this effort is mixed. Information gleaned from the visitation records has led some scholars to conclude that there was widespread indifference and resistance to learning the catechism.[49] Others have discovered significant success in teaching the young to recite the catechism by heart although this did not necessarily mean that they remembered it as adults or understood it in any meaningful way.[50] One historian has concluded that by the 1570s in the city of Strasbourg "the laity had come to know what they were supposed

---

[46] Ibid., 1:425.

[47] Ibid., 1:423. It is difficult to say exactly when the Lutheran practice of confirmation began. Any tendency toward some sort of public examination of children prior to their first communion hit a snag mid-century when a reassertion of the Catholic sacrament of confirmation was included as a condition of the Interim. As a result, a controversy as to whether it could be considered an indifferent matter (adiaphoron) began, a debate that seems to have scared some Lutherans away from any formalized celebration of the ceremony. See Bjarne Hareide, *Die Konfirmation in der Reformationzeit: Eine Untersuchung der lutherischen Konfirmation in Deutschland 1520–1585* (Göttingen, 1971). Some territories, such as Saxony, merely recommended a more thorough examination prior to a child's first communion, a practice that Bernard Vogler sees as fairly widespread. "Volksfrömmigkeit," p. 41. Martin Chemnitz recommended a more elaborate examination of children that emphasized a public declaration of faith as a precondition to the first reception of the sacrament, but this does not appear to have gained wide usage until the late 17th century when the Pietists, who considered confirmation a renewal of baptismal vows and expression of inner conversion, put it to widespread use. Karant-Nunn, *Reformation of Ritual*, p. 69, n. 123. Graff suggests that in those places where some form of confirmation had been established, it fell out of use during the Thirty Years War and was only rescusitated by the Pietists in the late 17th century. *Geschichte der Auflösung*, pp. 319–20.

[48] *Kirchenordnungen*, 4:85.

[49] Lang, "'Ein Grobes, Unbändiges Volk,'" pp. 60–61.

[50] Bernhard Vogler, "Die Entstehung der protestantischen Volksfrömmigkeit in der rheinischen Pfalz zwischen 1555 und 1619," *ARG* 72 (1981): 192.

to believe".[51] Although rote memorization of the catechism did not necessarily produce clear doctrinal understanding and common folk sometimes used these ideas in their own unique ways,[52] some appear to have understood it. In doctrinal controversies parishioners occasionally referred to the catechisms to justify their position to the authorities.[53] Vogler has concluded that through their knowledge of the catechism, "a considerable percentage of the people gained a religious zeal and certainty of belief".[54]

During this period schools increasingly became official training grounds for good Christians and citizens, mandated to teach the fear of God, languages and arts, and proper discipline—or in modern terminology, Lutheranism, secular learning, and good behavior. Already during the early decades of the Reformation, many territorial churches had established Latin schools for boys and German schools for boys and girls. Due to the political as well as religious utility of Latinate individuals, the Latin schools, found in important cities, were frequently funded at least in part by the central government, a trend that continued during the second half of the 16th century. There the Melanchthonian humanist curriculum was used.[55]

One important role played by students from the Latin schools (and vernacular ones in the countryside) was singing for various church services, a task that undoubtedly helped inculcate Lutheranism. Schoolmasters, who worked with the boys during the week, led the congregational

---

[51] Lorna Jane Abray, "The Laity's Religion: Lutheranism in 16th Century Strasbourg," in *The German People and the Reformation*, ed. R. Po-Chia (Ithaca, 1998) pp. 216–32, here at p. 221; Vogler suggests that during this period the majority of children in German Lutheran lands could recite Luther's *Small Catechism* from memory. "Volksfrömmigkeit," p. 44.

[52] Natalie Zemon Davis, "From 'Popular Religion' to Religious Cultures," in Ozment, *Reformation Europe*, pp. 321–41, here p. 330.

[53] In the intra-Lutheran doctrinal controversies that occurred in North German territory of Mansfeld, a few laymen actually argued a point using their catechisms. Others merely promised to adhere to the catechism as an articulation of proper doctrine; Robert Christman, "Heretics in Luther's Homeland: The Controversy over Original Sin in Late 16th-Century Mansfeld" (Ph.D. disseration., University of Arizona, 2004), p. 454.

[54] "…daß ein bedeutender Teil der Bevölkerung dadurch zu einem religiösen Schwung und zur Gewißheit des Glaubens kam," Vogler, "Volksfrömmigkeit," p. 44.

[55] For example, see the ordinance for the territory of Oldenburg. *Kirchenordnungen*, 7.2.1:1115–18. For more on the curricula and administration of the Latin schools and vernacular schools, see Carmen Luke, *Pedagogy, Printing, and Protestantism: The Discourse on Childhood* (Albany, 1989), esp. pp. 111–31.

singing and assisted in the liturgy.[56] By 1580 churchmen in Electoral Saxony bemoaned the fact that frequent singing responsibilities at funerals cut into the school day, so burial times were standardized to fit around this schedule.[57] Although officials occasionally admitted that the Latin schools were not performing to their expectations, they appear to have been generally successful.

The prevalence and quality of German-language village or congregational schools is more difficult to evaluate. Because financial responsibility for these schools fell most heavily on local authorities, they were not always well funded. Moreover, attendance seems to have been less than optimal, as evinced by the *Haustafel* literature's repeated admonition that parents send their children, a request echoed in the church ordinances. Instruction could be sub-par, as teachers were scolded for not keeping orderly school hours, or having students all recite their lessons simultaneously rather than individually. Despite these problems over the course of the 16th and early 17th centuries vernacular schools became increasingly widespread. One historian has suggested that by the 1580s and 1590s in Saxony "…village schools taught by sextons or schoolmasters were the rule rather than the exception".[58] Another has estimated that by 1618, in most territories, every church congregation had established a school, attended by twenty to fifty per cent of the boys.[59] During the course of the century German schools for girls were also established in which reading and writing, the catechism, prayers, and the hymns of Luther were taught.[60]

In addition to religious education in the forums of church and school, the reformers hoped that the home would be a locus of spiritual instruction and devotion, a point emphasized in the *Haustafel* literature. Churchmen had clear ideas about home pedagogy. During the early years of the Reformation they appropriated the ancient concept of the head of the household (*paterfamilias*) and imbued it with a spiritual

---

[56] On students' role in the church service see Christopher Brown, *Singing the Gospel. Lutheran Hymns and the Success of the Reformation* (Cambridge, MA, 2005), pp. 59–65.

[57] *Kirchenordnungen*, 1:438.

[58] Gerald Strauss, *Luther's House of Learning: Indoctrination of the Young in the German Reformation* (Baltimore, 1978), p. 22.

[59] Vogler, "Volksfrömmigkeit," p. 44.

[60] For more on the availability of schooling for girls and their curricula see Cornelia Niekus Moore, *The Maiden's Mirror: Reading Material for German Girls in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Wiesbaden, 1987), particularly pp. 131–36.

dimension,[61] so that the housefather (*Hausvater*) and, for some authors, the housemother (*Hausmutter*) bore the responsibility for the spiritual welfare of the extended family.[62]

The spiritual role of the housefather had many facets. In the introduction to his Large Catechism (1529) Luther made housefathers responsible for weekly catechetical examinations of children and servants.[63] During the course of the 16th century the housefathers' duties came to encompass those of a husband, father, ruler, and bishop, and included studying the catechism and Bible, teaching children and servants the fundamentals of belief and prayer, and imposing strict discipline.[64] Church ordinances from the later 16th century added specific tasks and supports for the housefathers. In Electoral Saxony parents were expected to help children and servants prepare for confession by explaining the catechism to them, particularly the section on communion.[65] To help them admonish their charges to lead sober lives, the churchmen commanded that all *Gastungen* be closed on Saturday nights and evenings before a holiday. To assist them in their duties as teachers, the traditional pericopes were used, specifically so that housefathers might become familiar with these important texts and acquire the ability to explain them. Moreover, pastors were told to preach on the story associated with the upcoming festival at the vesper services on the festival eve, so that housefathers might be prepared to discuss it with their charges.

Although it is difficult to discover the degree to which housefathers responded to the instructions of the churchmen, at least one historian has found evidence of an increase in both individual and family

---

[61] On the general history and development of *Hausväterliche Literatur* see Manfred Lemmer, "Haushalt und Familie aus der Sicht der Hausväterliteratur," in *Haushalt und Familie in Mittelalter und früher Neuzeit*, ed. Trude Ehlert (Sigmaringen, 1991), pp. 181–91; and Heinz Haushofer, "Der Literatur der Hausväter," *Zeitschrift für Agrargeschichte und Agrarsoziologie* 33 (1985), 127–41. For the spiritual role of the housefather, see Harm Klueting, "Das Hausvater als Pfarrer und Bischof," in *Fides et Pietas: Festschrift Martin Brecht zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. Christian Peters and Jürgen Kampmann (Münster, 2003), pp. 33–42.

[62] Klueting argues that for Luther the office of the *Hausvater* could be carried out by either of the parents, ibid., pp. 33–42; see also n. 15.

[63] Moreover, the headings for the sections of Luther's Small Catechism in the original broadsheet printings contain the phrase, "wie sie ein Hausvater seinem gesinde einfeltiglich fürhalten sol".

[64] For a comprehensive discussion of the role of the housefather, see Marjorie Elizabeth Plummer, "Reforming the Family: Marriage, Gender, and the Lutheran Household in Early Modern Germany, 1500–1620," (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Virginia, 1996), esp. pp. 188–96.

[65] *Kirchenordnungen*, 1:427.

devotions after mid-century. Prayer books multiplied and were filled with increasingly specific prayers pertinent to each estate and calling found in the *Haustafel*. Hymnals, postils, psalters, New Testaments, and complete copies of the Bible proliferated, suggesting the presence of a vibrant Lutheran book culture. By 1600 many families began and ended the day with the Lord's Prayer, morning and evening prayers, and said a blessing and prayer of thanks before and after meals.[66]

Ecclesiastical Ceremonies and Sacraments

In his 1520 treatise, *The Babylonian Captivity of the Church*, Luther rejected four of the medieval church's seven sacraments,[67] retaining only baptism, communion, and penance. In the following decades the reformers also modified the sacramental liturgies and established new rituals associated with weddings, confession, and burials, forms they attempted to standardize and implement during the period in question. But most striking was their effort to accentuate the pedagogical opportunities inherent in these rites, as part of their campaign to inculcate Lutheranism.

As in the early Reformation, church ordinances from the second half of the 16th century described baptism as a way to drive out the devil, a conduit for grace, a manifestation of the washing away of sin, and a means of incorporation into the body of Christ.[68] But in the second half of the 16th century, it became mandatory for baptisms to take place during church services, in order to remind the congregation of these explanations and of their own baptisms. Even cases in which babies underwent emergency baptisms but then survived became opportunities for instruction of the laity. For them a rite was performed in the

[66] Vogler, "Volksfrömmigkeit," pp. 44–45; However, Hans-Christoph Rublack suggests that the household church, as envisioned by the reformers, was found only in some noble and patrician families during this period. It was only "at the end of the early modern era" that they became a reality in the villages, "New Patterns of Christian Life," in *Handbook of European History 1400–1600: Late Middle Ages, Renaissance and Reformation*, 2 vols., eds. Thomas Brady, et al. (Leiden, 1995), 2:585–607, here at p. 595.

[67] WA 6:484–573.

[68] *Kirchenordnungen*, 2:301; For a comparison of the late medieval and Lutheran ceremony of baptism, see Kent Burreson, "Water Surrounded by God's Word: The Diocese of Breslau as a Window into the Transformation of Baptism from the Medieval Period to the Reformation," in *Worship in Medieval and Early Modern Europe: Change and Continuity in Religious Practice*, ed. Karin Maag and John Witvliet (Notre Dame, IN, 2004), pp. 203–242.

presence of the congregation that consisted of the entire baptismal service, with the exception of the baptism itself.[69]

During the second half of the 16th century the Lutheran churchmen increasingly defined the role of the sponsors. Sponsors were expected to be upright individuals who knew their catechisms, and pastors were told to examine them in this regard.[70] Although no child was denied baptism, sponsorship was refused those individuals who did not meet the clerics' standards.[71] In spite of the churchmen's efforts the laity's understanding of the function of sponsors often seems to have emphasized its social and material rather than spiritual benefits.[72] The bond of godparentship could tighten relations within a community and offer financial benefits, for it was custom that each sponsor give a monetary gift to the child (*Taufpfennig*),[73] and other gifts throughout its lifetime.[74]

Exorcism as a component of baptism proved to be the most controversial aspect of the rite during this period, one that offers insight into the way the laity understood the sacrament. Luther included the practice in his *Taufbüchlein* of 1526, but many (including Luther himself) considered it *adiaphoron*, and most of the Protestant churches of southwestern Germany excluded the rite.[75] However, its strong rejection by the Calvinists led some territories to retain it, in order to demonstrate their Lutheran orthodoxy.[76]

For the laity, it seems, exorcism was very important. Bodo Nischan tells of a butcher who appeared in Dresden's *Hofkirche* for his daughter's baptism armed with a meat cleaver, threatening to split the minister's

---

[69] *Kirchenordnungen*, 4:91.

[70] It seems that many did. In 1566 the Thuringian pastor Georg Weitner wrote that he required all sponsors to come to his house prior to a baptism, where he explained the role and duties of a sponsor, *Kirchenordnungen*, 3:334. The Prussian ordinance comments, "Dazu sol bei der tauf niemand zu gevaterschaft, er sei denn unser wahren und christlichen religion, auch der artikel des glaubens und gebets nicht unwissend, zugelassen werden" ibid., 4:88.

[71] For examples see Christman, "Heretics in Luther's Homeland," especially pp. 338–40.

[72] Scott Dixon suggest that "for the laity, the logic ruling the occasion of baptism was primarily social," *The Reformation and rural society: The parishes of Brandenburg-Ansbach-Kulmbach, 1528–1603* (Cambridge, 1996), p. 167.

[73] *Kirchenordnungen*, 7,2.1:1200.

[74] Karant-Nunn, *Reformation of Ritual*, p. 63.

[75] This was undoubtedly because of the attitude and proximity of Bucer, Zwingli, Calvin, and their followers, all of whom considered it a papal relic.

[76] For a good overview of the controversy, see Bodo Nischan, "The Exorcism Controversy and Baptism in the Late Reformation," *SCJ* 18 (1989), 31–51.

skull if he omitted exorcism from the formula.[77] And although in 1582 the churchmen in Henneburg decided that exorcism should be eliminated, they recognized that the common man desired it and therefore retained it until the laity could be educated on the matter.[78] Such examples raise the possibility that some laity associated exorcism purely with Lutheran identity, or considered baptism primarily a magical rite that afforded protection from the devil. Widespread evidence of Catholic survivals associated with baptism, particularly rites designed to cleanse a child of demonic influences, raises further questions about lay understanding of the sacrament.[79] The fact that midwives had to be commanded not to pray to the Virgin Mary during an emergency baptism and sextons forbidden from selling leftover baptismal water because many believed it held supernatural powers, suggests a less than orthodox understanding of baptism among some Lutheran laity.[80]

Churchmen also found fault with what they considered the laity's overemphasis of the social function of baptism, bemoaning the fact that many did not take the sacrament seriously, often waiting weeks merely to allow time for friends to gather and elaborate preparations to be made. Later in the 16th century both ecclesiastical and secular authorities found it necessary to issue ordinances limiting the number of sponsors and guests, the length of the festivities, and the amount of beer served.[81]

Although Luther's declaration of reluctance to get involved in marriage issues is well-known, he and his followers waded in, rejecting the medieval view of marriage as a sacrament but emphasizing its importance as a divinely instituted estate. As such, they were eager to insert their understanding of marriage into the traditional wedding celebration, insisting that it include a church service that instructed the couple in their proper marital roles, joined them before God, and sent them into wedded life with his blessing. But the reformers also had to contend with a whole set of popular traditions surrounding weddings, many of which they viewed as morally suspect.[82]

---

[77] Ibid., p. 39.

[78] *Kirchenordnungen*, 2:304. For other examples of lay resistance to the suspension of exorcism, see Karant-Nunn, *Reformation of Ritual*, pp. 59–60.

[79] *Kirchenordnungen*, 1:365.

[80] Ibid., 1:426.

[81] See regulations for the territory of Oldenburg, ibid., 7,2,1:1172–74.

[82] Karant-Nunn argues convincingly that the church ceremony remained but a small part of the elaborate ritual of joining a couple as practiced in 16th-century German lands, which she describes in detail, *Reformation of Ritual*, pp. 22–32.

Lutheran churchmen envisioned the pair coming together with the consent of parents or guardians. If either spouse was not from the immediate vicinity, the home pastor or local authorities were contacted to confirm his or her single status, and the banns were read from the pulpit on three consecutive Sundays for the same reason. On the verge of establishing their own household, the young couple was expected by the church to know the tenets of their faith. Pastors examined the bride and groom with regard to their knowledge of the catechism, refusing to marry all who demonstrated deficiency. Church officials did their best to ensure that the laity understood the regulations regarding marriage, reciting them from the pulpit several times a year and offering scriptural readings that emphasized the proper relationship between spouses. As wedding sermons became ubiquitous in the second half of the 16th century, such texts formed their basis.[83]

From the perspective of church and state officials weddings continued to be problematic. Immoderate feasting and drinking remained widespread, actions that especially piqued the churchmen when they took place just prior to the church ceremony.[84] By the early 17th century pastors were informed not to proceed if couples and revelers showed up at the church inebriated.[85] Secular officials, too, became increasingly involved in the regulation of wedding festivities, limiting the number of guests, amount of beer served, and number of days a marriage could be celebrated.[86] Most of the evidence that speaks to the lay reaction to these attempts comes from official reports, which overwhelmingly indicate that little headway was made by the churchmen. Most laity, Vogler suggests, probably saw the church ceremony as an event that called down the blessings and protection of God.[87] For many, however, the social aspects of the wedding, upon which the clergy frowned while tolerating, appear to have remained the most important component of the elaborate marriage rituals.

---

[83] Ibid., pp. 20–21.

[84] In the villages of Saxony it was tradition for the groom and his friends to feast at the bride's father's house prior to the church ceremony. Sehling, *Kirchenordnungen*, 1:436.

[85] Ibid., 7,2,1:1203; In the Duchy of Prussia, weddings were to take place at 10:00 a.m. If the wedding party delayed their arrival until after 10:30 a.m., the pastor was to refuse to marry them, ibid., 4:94.

[86] In 1622 the territory of Sachsen-Weimar went so far as to insist that officials be present at wedding dances to detect and punish immodest behavior. Karant-Nunn, *Reformation of Ritual*, 31, n. 119.

[87] Vogler, "Volksfrömmigkeit," p. 41.

The North German church ordinances of the late 16th century all include a description of private confession and absolution,[88] which normally took place at the conclusion of Saturday afternoon vespers, and was a requirement for all who desired to commune the following day. In confession and absolution the churchmen made a sharp distinction between the *Ohrenbeicht* required of the Catholics, which, they claimed, murdered people's souls with its prying, and the gentler, more pedagogical Lutheran form, the purpose of which was to pronounce forgiveness of sins and thus console tender and contrite hearts.[89] The laity was not to be forced to list their sins, nor were pastors to inquire about transgressions left unmentioned by a parishioner. Moreover, pastors were told to tread lightly so as not to scare their parishioners away. They were to examine the laity with regard to their knowledge of the catechism (especially those sections pertinent to confession), explain them if necessary, then ask whether the confessant repented of his or her sins. The unrepentant were to be refused communion.

The benefits of communion were articulated to the laity as follows: it strengthened faith, demonstrated the forgiveness of sins, and bolstered dedication to keeping the commandments while helping to resist the devil, the world, and the corrupt flesh. Communion services took place on Sundays and festival days, and parishioners attended as often as they desired.[90]

---

[88] In the more thoroughly Lutheranized lands of northern Germany, such as electoral Saxony, private confession continued after the introduction of the Reformation. The practice was established more slowly in the Lutheran territories of southern Germany (often not until the end of the 16th century), due to its proximity to Zwingli, Bucer, Calvin, and their followers, reformers who felt that priestly absolution undermined Christ as the only source of forgiveness and therefore did not insist upon private confession. In the South private confession, like exorcism, became a distinguishing ritual, a benchmark that indicated the degree to which a territory had embraced Lutheranism. On private confession, its institution, and role in society see Ronald K. Rittgers, *The Reformation of the Keys: Confession, Conscience, and Authority in Sixteenth-Century Germany* (Cambridge, MA, 2004), idem, "Private Confession and the Lutheranization of Sixteenth-Century Nördlingen," *SCJ* 36 (2005): 1063–85; Hans-Christoph Rublack, "Lutherische Beichte und Sozialdisziplinierung," *ARG* 84 (1993), 127–55; and Karant-Nunn, *Reformation of Ritual*, pp. 94–104.

[89] Prussia's pastors were told to instruct the parishioners in the catechism so that they might not attend communion unworthily, admonish them to fulfill their calling, and console their consciences. *Kirchenordnungen*, 4:76.

[90] Although there were regional variations, by 1550 among German Lutheran congregations it was available "at least several times a year," Karant-Nunn, *Reformation of Ritual*, p. 125; Rublack claims, however, that "communion was taken once or twice a year on dates tied to the harvest cycle". "New Patterns," p. 595.

Many individuals, visitors reported, failed to embrace confession and communion as the churchmen would have liked. Visitors frequently lamented the presence of parishioners who had not been to communion in five, ten, fifteen years, or even in their entire lives.[91] Church ordinances informed pastors that, when no one communed on a given Sunday, they should use that particular time in the service to admonish the parishioners to attend. Some, it seems, merely refused to participate,[92] others may have been scared away by confession[93] or objected to communion's increasing use as an instrument of social integration.[94]

Moreover, many who did attend appear not to have grasped confession and communion as the reformers intended. As late as 1580 churchmen in Electoral Saxony admitted that the commoners (*gemeine pövel*) did not understand confession but attended out of blind tradition.[95] When they did, it could be a raucous affair, for the pastors were told to admonish those waiting not to gossip but to pray quietly.[96] Some church ordinances describe the types of confessant the pastors would encounter: the completely immoral who did not know their catechisms and came only to prove that they were not pagans; those who knew the Christian religion but nonetheless led impenitent lives; and the truly repentant. The pastors were to command the first type to learn their catechisms, bar the second group from communion, and console the third.[97] Regulations for post-communion activities also indicate that not all laity approached the sacrament with the degree of reverence pastors thought necessary, as parishioners had to be admonished to avoid the taverns and not engage in wild dances on days that they had communed. However, in spite of the evidence that many of the laity disregarded or misunderstood clerical views of confession and communion, Vogler

[91] *Kirchenordnungen*, 7,2,1:1197. For examples from the visitation records, see Lang, "'Ein grobes, unbändiges Volk,'" p. 55.

[92] Vogler suggests that this group included especially those at the very lowest rungs of society, such as beggars, shepherds, and alcoholics, "Volksfrömmigkeit," p. 39.

[93] Karant-Nunn believes that "lay people found the procedure painful but not so painful that they would not tolerate it," *Reformation of Ritual*, p. 106.

[94] Vogler, "Volksfrömmigkeit," p. 39; for a provocative study of lay refusal to attend communion and its social meaning, see David Sabean, *The Power in the Blood: Popular Culture and Village Discourse in Early Modern Germany* (Cambridge, 1984), pp. 37–60.

[95] *Kirchenordnungen*, 1:427.

[96] Ibid., 1:428.

[97] Ibid., 7,2,1:1086; The Prussian church ordinance lists ten types of individuals that the pastors were likely to encounter during confession, along with advice on how to handle each type, ibid., 4:76–77.

posits a relative improvement in participation in the sacrament, combined with a slow change in mentality toward it between 1555 and 1620.[98] Indeed, by 1566 one Thuringian pastor could describe the demeanor of his communicants as "reverent and devotional".[99]

During this period Lutheran churchmen implemented new rites and expanded church services for the burial of the dead.[100] Gradually an elaborate Lutheran form of the *ars moriendi* developed, so that if circumstances allowed, the role of the pastor began already at the bedside. There he instructed the dying in the proper understanding of death, helped reconcile him with Christ by hearing a final confession followed by communion, and consoled the family and friends.[101] The dying were urged to trust solely in God and the mediating work of Christ.

Funerary rites, cleansed of all references to purgatory and prayers for the dead, were performed in an orderly fashion so that they might serve the dual function of instructing the living and honoring the dead.[102] Burials were to take place within a day, precluding the presence of friends and relatives from far away. Bells were rung so that the people might gather. The body, wrapped in cloth, was processed to the grave in a column that included the churchmen, children from the school to do the singing, and the family and friends of the deceased. A short sermon, no longer than half an hour, was often preached at the graveside.[103]

In most territories funeral sermons became a requirement shortly after mid-century, and their object was to instruct the living in how to prepare for death and console the bereaved family members. Increasingly

---

[98] Vogler believes that by 1600 participation in communion in Electoral Saxony and Württemburg was acceptable to the churchmen, while in churches in the Rhine region, it lagged significantly. In general, however, he sees a relative improvement in attendance and comprehension during the period. "Volksfrömmigkeit," p. 39.

[99] Sehling, *Kirchenordnungen*, 2:330.

[100] Craig Koslofsky claims that of all Lutheran rituals, funerary and burial practices were most drastically altered from their medieval predecessors, *The Reformation of the Dead: Death and Ritual in Early Modern Germany, 1450–1700* (New York, 2000), p. 81. For a detailed account of the early development of Lutheran funerary theology and ritual, see pp. 81–100. See also Karant-Nunn, *Reformation of Ritual*, pp. 138–89.

[101] Ibid., pp. 150–55.

[102] Koslofsky, *Reformation of the Dead*, p. 100. Koslofsky emphasizes the continuity between the medieval and late 16th-century Lutheran funeral ritual regarding its function to honor the dead according to their station in life. Thus, in addition to performing a pedagogical function, Lutheran funerals served to distinguish and strengthen social hierarchies.

[103] In some territories, a funeral sermon was preached in the church, in others it consisted only of a graveside service, which included a short sermon.

churchmen dictated acceptable sermon themes, which included: death is the wages of sin; human existence is ephemeral, so it is necessary to prepare for death; Christ alone brings salvation from eternal death; the resurrection and eternal life are real; and all who believe in Christ will be raised to eternal life.[104] When the deceased was mentioned, it was as an example of one who believed these things and demonstrated them in his life by frequently partaking of the sacraments, by his behavior, and by his departure from this world as a fully committed Christian. Thus, the departed, too, became a pedagogical tool.

Because Lutherans rejected the idea of purgatory or any immediate judgment, the cemetery took on a new meaning. As the Prussian ordinance states, deceased Christians were now at rest in Christ, like the flowers that withdraw all their powers into their roots during winter, only to reawaken in the springtime to their full glory.[105] Unrepentant sinners were to be buried without church honors outside the cemetery (a practice that occurred frequently) in order to dissuade others from remaining recalcitrant.[106] Moreover, cemeteries were to be kept in good order as the final resting place (*Ruhebett*) of those who died in the Lord, which meant they were to be enclosed and no longer used as pasture, a place to store various items, or even as latrines.

Among the commoners, however, a wide variety of beliefs and practices contrary to official Lutheran doctrine remained common. Clerical attempts to establish a clear separation between the dead and the living[107] were largely unsuccessful, especially in rural areas.[108] Last communion was considered by many parishioners to be a ticket into

---

[104] Authors of the Saxon church ordinance of 1580 actually include three sample funeral sermons for use by the clergy, *Kirchenordnungen*, 1:371–375. See essay III above, pp. 131–132.

[105] *Kirchenordnungen*, 4:101.

[106] In 1580 church officials in the territory of Mansfeld, which had recently undergone a terrible doctrinal controversy, published a special ordinance against the burial of the dead who died outside the arms of the church, justifying the action by claiming that is was merely an extension of the bann, ibid., 1:246. However, an honorable church burial was also often denied marginal individuals, such as notorious drunkards or suicides who were not yet under the bann, suggesting that it served to widen the scope of social discipline, Koslofsky, *Reformation of the Dead*, p. 101.

[107] Both Karant-Nunn and Koslofsky see this as a central goal of Lutheran funerary doctrine and practice, *Reformation of Ritual*, p. 187, and *Reformation of the Dead*, p. 19.

[108] Robert Scribner described a variety of popular practices surrounding death and burial that, he claims, demonstrate "the continuance of a very potent relationship between the living and the dead…". "The Impact of the Reformation on Daily Life," in *Religion and Culture in Germany (1400–1800)* ed. Lyndal Roper (Leiden, 2001), pp. 275–301, here at pp. 293–98.

heaven, so that its reception took the place of extreme unction in the popular mind.[109] Efforts to ensure that cemeteries were well kept met with resistance, as churchmen and visitors continued to rail against their misuse well into the 17th century.[110] Nonetheless, evidence from wills has indicated the beginnings of change around 1580, when those made by Lutherans become increasingly Christocentric.[111]

Enforcement and Policing

Crucial to the efforts of churchmen to instill Lutheranism in their parishioners was the attempt to control their behavior, an issue that received increasing attention during this period, as clerics instructed their parishioners how to lead God-pleasing lives and created mechanisms to correct them when they sinned. So important did they consider the necessity of proper parishioner discipline, that some churchmen put it on par with preaching the Word, stating that "…next to pure doctrine should stand Christian discipline, and all properly installed, true pastors should be devoted to it to the same degree that they are devoted to the teaching itself".[112]

Motivations for imposing morality were in large part rooted in the pastoral function,[113] as demonstrated by the churchmen's use of Matthew 18:15–17 as the basis for enforcing Christian behavior.[114] To their way of thinking, the system that they created was merely the institutionalization of Jesus' commands regarding the treatment of a wayward brother: admonish a sinner to improve, expel him from the church if he failed, and reintegrate him if he showed a change of

---

[109] Vogler "Volksfrömmigkeit," p. 42.

[110] Vogler claims that upkeep of the cemeteries began to improve only after about 1650, ibid., p. 43; Lang suggests that the concept of the cemetery as a quiet place of rest became widespread first in the 18th century. "'Ein grobes, unbändiges Volk,'" p. 52.

[111] Vogler has found that after this date those writing wills often commend their souls to God's mercy or to Christ the Savior, who, they claim, alone offers eternal life through his grace. "Volksfrömmigkeit," pp. 41–42.

[112] "…neben der reinen lere auch christliche discipline gehen und sein soll, und allen rechschaffenen treuen predigern uber derselben nichts wenigers, als uber der lere selbst zuhalten…". *Kirchenordnungen*, 2: 240.

[113] Martin Brecht, "Protestantische Kirchenzucht zwischen Kirche und Staat. Bemerkungen zur Forschungssituation," in *Kirchenzucht und Sozialdisziplinierung im frühneuzeitlichen Europa, Zeitschrift für historische Forschung. Beiheft* 16, ed. Heinz Schilling (Berlin, 1994), pp. 41–48, here at 42.

[114] Both Electoral Saxony and the territory of Mansfeld cite these verses as grounds for their efforts at disciplining the laity, *Kirchenordungen*, 1:433; and 1:209.

heart. The process varied over time and space, but generally Lutheran territories used some combination of pastoral admonition, the bann, consistories, and ecclesiastical visitations to instruct and enforce proper behavior. Often these goals coincided with those of the early modern state, interested in creating disciplined, obedient subjects.[115] Because of this overlap, the temporal authorities provided financial and judicial support, and increasingly became directly involved, as manifested by their role in the consistories and visitations, as well as their promulgation of moral strictures in the "*Policei-Ordnungen*".[116]

In most cases when a pastor noticed someone acting against proper beliefs or morals his first response was to privately admonish the sinner.[117] If the behavior continued, the pastor and some combination of clerical colleagues and selected laymen exhorted him to repent. If the urgings of this small group had no effect, the minor bann was imposed,[118] most often in cases that involved public sins.[119] Individuals

---

[115] Interest in disciplining the folk represents a clear point of connection between the church and governmental authorities during the early modern period, argue the proponents of the confessionalization thesis. Heinz Schilling points to the identical nature of the goals of these authorities, claiming that church discipline performed "the same social function of obliging the people of the church, and hence all subjects, to observe the religious and ethical standards of their respective confessional systems, which were at the same time the norms of the disciplined, rationally organized modern society," "Confessionalization in the Empire: Religious and Societal Change in Germany Between 1555 and 1620," in *Religion, Political Culture and the Emergence of Early Modern Society: Essays in German and Dutch History* (Leiden, 1992), pp. 205–45, here p. 233; however, although he acknowledges similarities in their objectives, Martin Brecht rightly cautions not to assume that ecclesiastical and temporal authorities were necessarily motivated by the same reasons, "Protestantische Kirchenzucht," pp. 41–43.

[116] For a good general description of the variety of efforts made by the combined forces of the church and state at instilling social discipline during this period, see R. Po-Chia Hsia, *Social Discipline in the Reformation: Central Europe 1550–1750* (London, 1989). The term "*Policey-Ordnungen*" in 16th century German refers to governmentally promulgated regulations for public life, see *Deutsches Wörterbuch*, ed. Jacob und Wilhelm Grimm 7 (Leipzig, 1889), ed. Matthias von Lexer, col. 1984.

[117] In some territories laymen (referred to as *Sehenschoppen* or *Kirchenveter*) were chosen to help the pastor look for immoral behavior. In 1555 Mansfeld's superintendent established such a position: "…So mus man…vier Senscheppfen in einer jeden Gemeine verordenen…die auch sollen vereidet werden/ und derer Ampt sein sol/ das sie das gantze jar uber/ neben irem Pastor/ auf all schande/ laster/ und untugend/ mit vleis und ernst sehen wollen". Erasmus Sarcerius, *Von Jherlicher Visitation/ und was hiedurch fur mengel/ und gebrechen/ fast an allen orten mögen befunden werden* (Eisleben, 1555), p. 9.

[118] Both Luther and Melanchthon recognized the two degrees or grades of the bann, and many of the Lutheran territories continued to use them.

[119] These might include: adultery, blasphemy, despising preaching and the Word, accidentally suffocating infants by rolling onto them while asleep, murder, and practicing magic and fortune telling or consulting their practitioners.

under the minor bann were refused participation in the rites of the church, including baptismal sponsorship, absolution, and communion. The church ordinances warned pastors to avoid the bann if possible, but when necessary, to employ it with tenderness, solely for the improvement of the sinner.

If the individual still refused to change his ways, the case was sent to the consistory (the spiritual court), where he was again admonished, and, failing improvement, placed under the major bann: officially excommunicated. In electoral Saxony this meant that the sinner stood in front of his congregation while a formula was read describing the process of the bann as well as the individual's sins. The temporal authorities then refused the excommunicate attendance at all "honorable" gatherings, and other parishioners were commanded to avoid him.[120] In Saxony, if the major bann did not work, the individual was turned over to the temporal authorities, who were responsible for civil, perhaps even physical, punishment.[121]

If at any point in the process the individual responded positively to the admonitions, he would be ritually reintegrated into the congregation. In the case of the major bann local pastors were to file a report with the consistory, which revisited the case, and if evidence allowed, ordered reinstatement. However, public penance was still required, which often included the sinner publicly reading an official formula stating his offenses and acknowledging remorse for them.[122]

The degree to which the system of admonition and banning worked is unclear. The church officials themselves saw potential for its abuse and warned pastors against placing individuals under the bann for insignificant reasons or out of a desire for revenge. Furthermore, parishioners' responses to the bann were not always those desired by the clerics. In 1581, in the territory of Mansfeld, an individual named Wolf Hirsch was accused of heresy for upholding Matthias Flacius's and Cyriakus Spangenberg's view of original sin as the substance of the sinner. After being placed under the major bann, he was told that it would be lifted

[120] *Kirchenordnungen*, 1:434.

[121] One punishment was to have the unrepentant sinner stand at the front door of the church for a few Sundays in a row, holding a white staff, ibid., 1:423; another was to expel him from the territory, ibid., 1:210.

[122] The church ordinance for Prussia indicates that such public penance does not make payment for sins but is necessary to demonstrate proof of penitence, remorse, and a desire for grace, as well as the wish to be reintegrated into the Christian community, which has been so deeply offended, ibid., 4:96.

only if he signed the Formula of Concord. Hirsch refused, stating that "he was not of the opinion that he would reconcile himself with the church or as he put it, allow himself to be judged from the pulpit, because he and his family had lived here for many years, but they do not owe this to anyone".[123] The implication is that Hirsch considered himself and his family full members in the community, in spite of the church's judgement on the matter.

Consistories provided another layer of oversight and a means by which to monitor and inculcate beliefs and behavior.[124] During the second half of the 16th century, many German-speaking Lutheran territories established these church courts, which generally consisted of an approximately equal number of individuals from ecclesiastical and temporal realms, along with a notary to record proceedings. Depending upon the territory, a variety of temporal as well as spiritual issues fell under their jurisdiction. Most heard conflicts regarding the beliefs and behavior of clerics and the administration of church goods. Laity came into contact with consistories mainly for marriage-related issues or public sins.[125] Consistories could impose the bann, fines, and jail time as punishments, and all secular officials were required to execute their judgments.

Although scant research has been done on the workings of Lutheran consistories, a preliminary examination of the records from the territory of Mansfeld between 1584 and 1588 suggests the following general conclusions.[126] The consistory met on the first day of each month, averaging about fifteen cases per meeting,[127] approximately half of which were marriage-related. Witnesses were summoned and heard, a process that sometimes drew cases out over a period of months or even years. Often

[123] "…wehre er doch nicht bedacht sich mit der Kirchen zu versohnen, (oder wie ers nent) von der Canzal werten zu lassen, Denn er und sein geschlecht hatten nun viel jahre hier gewohnet, aber ein solchs nicht verschuldet," Sachsen-Anhalt Landesarchiv, Magdeburg MS Rep. A 12 a III, no. 833 fol. 48a.

[124] Lutheran consistories have received slight attention, particularly when compared to Reformed consistories. Among Lutherans, these courts were sometimes called *Ehegerichte* (marriage courts), but most often *Consistoria* (consistories).

[125] The Oldenburg consistory had jurisdiction over conflicts in doctrine, cases in which the laity did not respond to pastoral admonition, and marriage issues. *Kirchenordnungen*, 7,2,1:1122; Consistories in Mansfeld and Mark Brandenburg were also given the task of censoring the printers, ibid., 1:200–201, 4:127.

[126] Sachsen-Anhalt Landesarchiv, Außenstelle Wernigerode, MS Rep. A 12 aIII 10, "Consistorium Protokollen 1584–1588".

[127] The population of the territory was ca. 50,000.

the parishioners' own pastors provided testimony on behalf of one of the parties, either as someone personally aware of the circumstances or merely as character witnesses. Every effort was made to reconcile couples in conflict; divorces were almost never granted.

Non-marriage-related cases included problems with the teachings of pastors, strife between churchmen and laity, and a variety of behavioral problems (most often failure to attend the Lord's Supper, public drunkenness, practicing magic, blasphemy, immoral sexual behavior, and infrequently, heterodox beliefs). In such cases pastors brought accusations against parishioners, sometimes arriving at the consistory with a list of individuals whose behavior they deemed problematic. Parishioners were called before the consistory, admonished to improve, and warned that their progress would be monitored at the next visitation. Thus, in Mansfeld the consistory was designed to work in conjunction with church visitations.

Already early in the Reformation ecclesiastical visitations performed an important role in the education and disciplining of the laity.[128] The first, conducted in Saxony between 1528 and 1531 by Luther and his immediate circle, provided a model for all subsequent visitations in Lutheran territories.[129] It addressed primarily the teachings and behavior of the pastors, church practice, and the physical and financial aspects of the church.[130] During the second half of the century the beliefs and behavior of the laity increasingly became a focus of the visitors' attention, as they began to investigate public sins and record their observations in protocols, later consolidated into reports called *Abschieden*. As with the consistory, teams of visitors were comprised of both ecclesiastical and secular authorities. Parishioners were warned ahead of time of an impending visitation, and sometimes the ques-

[128] For a brief introduction to church visitations in the early modern period, see Peter Thaddäus Lang, "Die Bedeutung der Kirchenvistationen für die Geschichte der Frühen Neuzeit. Eine Forschungsbericht," in *Rottenburger Jahrbuch für Kirchengeschichte* 3 (1984), 207–12. For a general overview in English see Strauss, *Luther's House of Learning*, esp. Chapter 12, "Visitations and Visitation Records". For a partial but impressive list of Catholic and Protestant visitation records, both published and in manuscript form, see *Kirche und Visitation: Beiträge zur Erforschung des frühneuzeitlichen Visitationswesens in Europa*, ed. Ernst Walter Zeeden and Peter Thaddäus Lang (Stuttgart, 1984).

[129] Strauss, *Luther's House of Learning*, p. 251.

[130] Pallas, *Die Registraturen der Kirchenvisitationen*, 41,1:7–48.

tions were read from the pulpit prior to the visitation, so that all might ponder their answers.[131]

Normally a visitation began with a short sermon describing the nature of the visitation, demonstrating its biblical precedents, and articulating its goals. After the pastors were questioned regarding their own duties, the visitors then asked them about their parishioners, particularly cases of adultery, use of magic, pilgrimages, open blasphemy, failure to attend church services and the sacrament, usury, slander, unlawful divorce, and children who despised their parents. Moreover, visitors inquired as to whether the pastors themselves had publicly and privately addressed such sins, a clear reference to the process of pastoral admonition.[132] Next the visitors examined the beliefs of the laity by testing representatives of the old and young as to their knowledge of the catechism. Finally, the visitors probed the behavior of the laity, asking them whether their fellow parishioners were involved in the same list of sins mentioned above.

Methods and means for punishing offenders varied. In some territories reports were passed to the consistory, which then addressed the individual circumstances,[133] but in others the first line of defense was the local authorities, who were told to admonish public sinners.[134] Major offenses were handed over to the secular courts and reported to the pastoral synod.[135] Visitations, although often sporadic, offered one more layer of oversight, one with a very short chain of command. Visitors need not wait for reports regarding the unorthodox beliefs or misbehavior of the laity to work their way from the local level to the consistory. Furthermore, they offered a corrective against pastoral laxity in disciplining the laity.

"*Policei-Ordnungen*," collections of regulations promulgated and enforced solely by the temporal authorities, demonstrate well the degree to which the temporal and ecclesiastical authorities supported one another in attempts to establish discipline. Already widespread in the 15th century, during the Reformation they increasingly began to focus on issues traditionally associated with morality and, therefore, the

[131] The church ordinance of Oldenburg recommends that the questions be read twice a year from the pulpit, *Kirchenordnungen*, 7,2,1:1126.
[132] Ibid., 7,2,1:1181.
[133] Pallas, *Die Registraturen der Kirchenvisitationen*, 41,1:114.
[134] Ibid., 41,1:142.
[135] Ibid.

church.[136] Luther's Reformation had regarded the temporal authorities as Christian magistrates ordained by God, and increasingly they used beliefs as the basis for the norms of outward behavior.[137] Moreover, the rationale for issuing such ordinances often involved the failure of church discipline. Because the people had refused correction by their pastors, consistories, and visitations, the temporal authorities were now forced to intervene directly,[138] a view frequently articulated at the beginning of the ordinances.[139]

The "*Policei-Ordnungen*" focused on the temporal impact of failures in discipline. Some note that the lavish celebrations associated with various church rites were wasteful and highly detrimental financially to families. Others take a more communal approach, suggesting that God's wrath in the form of plague, hunger, and fire would continue if steps were not taken to correct moral failings. One even suggests that by following the new regulations the citizenry would enjoy wisdom and happiness.[140]

Specifically, the ordinances were designed to enforce outward conformity to the rules of the church, placing limits on the number of guests, types of food, and amount of beer at weddings, baptisms, and burials, and ensuring church attendance by closing all taverns and jailing individuals who refused to attend. The ordinances also address marriage issues, particularly secret engagements, and regulate a variety of different social events that led to "unseemly" sexual fraternization. Finally, blaspheming and swearing were outlawed, as were all forms of magic, gambling, excessive drunkenness, adultery, and divorce.

Although their influence has yet to be uncovered, most indirect evidence suggests that the "*Policei-Ordnungen*"—as is the case with all

---

[136] On the development of police ordinances, see Roland Axtmann, "'Police' and the Formation of the Modern State. Legal and Ideological Assumptions on State Capacity in the Austrian Lands of the Hapsburg Empire, 1500–1800," in *German History* 10 (1992), 39–61.

[137] Bettina Günther has demonstrated that the city councils of Frankfurt am Main and Nuremberg used this argument to justify promulgating "*Policei-Ordnungen*" that regulated a variety of moral behaviors. "Sittlichkeitsdelikte in den Policeyordnungen der Rechstädte Frankfurt am Main und Nuremberg (15.–17. Jahrhundert)," in *Policey und frühneuzeitliche Gesellschaft*, ed. Karl Härter (Frankfurt/M, 2000), pp. 121–48, here pp. 142–43.

[138] Ibid., p. 122.

[139] So begins the Erfurt police ordinance of 1583, *Kirchenordnungen*, 3:370. In Saxony-Anhalt, the formulators of the ordinance suggest that all subjects can go to church and hear how they are expected to behave, but because many do not, it is up to the secular authorities to ensure good behavior, ibid., 3:570.

[140] Ibid.

civil laws—did not attain their goals for civil order to the satisfaction of governmental authorities. The litany-like formula with which many begin often rehearses the fact that earlier promulgations of these laws had failed. Nonetheless, if one distances oneself from the question of success or failure and takes a wider view, "*Policei-Ordnungen*" do demonstrate that new norms of behavior were being formulated and the mere act of publicizing them served to articulate the power and control of these state authorities, even if obedience was slow in coming.[141]

The churchmen's attempt to shape parishioner piety during the period between 1550 and 1619 focused on inculcating Lutheran beliefs and behaviors they considered the obvious outgrowth of their doctrine. This meant that all opportunities for education were seized upon and tailored to meet the needs of specific social groups, and mechanisms for ensuring that parishioners followed the new norms of behavior were established and implemented.

Lay response to these efforts varied considerably over time and space. Attempts to accentuate the educational aspects of church rites and sacraments ran into a variety of social traditions, as well as general apathy, limiting their impact. However, while it is clear that some individuals chafed under the endeavor to assert increasing control over their lives, this was not always the case. Much was dependent upon the pastors, some of whom, for a time at least, were able to instill "Lutheranism" in their flocks. Cyriacus Spangenberg, writing after his expulsion from the town of Mansfeld for his controversial views on original sin, described his former church there in glowing terms:

> Strangers who passed through praised our church orders and services calling them a little paradise of the Lord. The little boys and girls were so well instructed, that they could discuss the articles of our teachings…better and more adroitly and convincingly than Mencel [Spangenberg's chief opponent in Mansfeld] and his group and many highly educated doctors. Our churches were always full of parishioners, and I found a devotion and a desire among the folk to hear sermons, pray, learn the catechism, and attend the sacraments. Indeed, there was an excellent love and unity between pastors and parishioners.[142]

---

[141] Achim Landwehr, "Normen als Praxis und Kultur. Policeyordnungen in der Frühen Neuzeit," *Wiener Zeitschrift zur Geschichte der Neuzeit* 4 (2004), 109–14, here at pp. 112–113.

[142] "Frembde Leute die da durchzogen/ und unser Kirchenordnunge und Gottesdienste sahen/ rhümeten solches an andern orten/ als einem kleinen Paradiß deß Herrn/ Es waren die kleinen Kinder/ Knaben und Mägdlein angerichtet und unterweiset/ das sie von allen artickeln der Lere…besser/ gründlicher/ artlicher und bescheidner

Undoubtedly Spangenberg depicted the situation in the most positive light in an effort to discredit those who had expelled him, but it is unlikely that he completely fabricated this vision. Moreover, Christopher Brown has found convincing evidence of vibrant Lutheran congregational and home life in the community of Joachimsthal during this period.[143] Such examples, which will likely increase in number as more local studies are undertaken, suggest that a linear movement toward "Lutheranism" among the laity is an oversimplification, and that, in the second half of the sixteenth century, some pastors had a great deal of success in instituting their program.

The Realities of Popular Piety in German-Speaking Lutheran Lands

Popular piety is more than the sum total of reactions to official clerical directives, but is its own entity, constantly developing, transforming, accepting, rejecting, incorporating, and excising impulses from a variety of sources. This final section takes a broader view of lay piety, sketching it from the perspective of the people themselves. But the picture that emerges is incomplete because of the fragmentary nature of the evidence and the fact that it is often contradictory.

For the churchmen the content of belief was central. Luther's fundamental discovery, that salvation is achieved by faith, placed great emphasis on the individual sinner's knowledge of essential doctrines. As outlined above, Luther and his successors sought to instill in each person a basic comprehension of Protestant theology. Despite these efforts, some historians believe that, taken as a whole, the common folk demonstrated little interest in dogmatic theology and, indeed, abstract beliefs.[144] In fact, a few scholars have posited the existence

---

reden kondten/ denn Mentzel mit alle seinem hauffen/ und vil grosser Hoch gelarter Doctores dazu/ Unsere Kirche war allezeit voller Zuhörer/ und funden ich die Leutlin mit lust unnd andacht zu Predigt/ zum Gebet/ zur ubung deß Catechischmi/ zu Sacramenten/ und sahe man feine liebe und eynigkeit zwischen Predigern und Zuhörern/ etc.," Cyriacus Spangenberg. *Caecitas Germaniae. Von der grossen grewlichen Blindheit Deutscher Nation in Götlichen Geistlichen Sachen* (n.p., 1582), p. 292.

[143] Brown, *Singing the Gospel*, especially, pp. 76–129.

[144] Van Dülmen states that "Religiös-dogmatisches Wissen spielt keine Rolle," in the religion of the people and "daß im einfachen Volk eine recht starke Resistenz gegenüber einer allzu abstrakten Glaubenslehre…blieb," "Volksfrömmigkeit und konfesionelles Christentum im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert," in, *Volkreligiosität in der modernen Sozialgeschichte*, ed. Wolfgang Schneider (Göttingen, 1986), pp. 14–30, here at pp. 19

of a folk religion, essentially different though not necessarily mutually exclusive from that of the clerical version. Characterized by a magical/superstitious worldview, this religion was oral and anchored in the concrete connections to life and work. To those who subscribed to it, purely spiritual encouragement and abstractions found little attraction, especially the Lutheran emphasis on trust in God rather than more immediate solutions to earthly problems. For this reason, argues Richard van Dülmen, the split between church-sanctioned piety and the reality among the masses actually widened during this period.[145] Moreover, such views are not far removed from Artomedes's "farmer mentality" exhibited by Cain, who believed in a God who sent good weather and food when placated, but for whom Christ's salvific efforts and the prospect of life after death held little concern.[146]

Although such views clearly existed and were probably widespread, other scholars have warned against assuming that humbler folk were not interested in abstract ideas[147] and are beginning to ask in particular which social groups were most receptive to the ideas of the Reformation during this later period. Many agree on the presence of an elite class among the laity, found primarily in the cities, which exhibited at least a general understanding of theological positions.[148] Others have found significant doctrinal comprehension among the lower nobility and rural notables.[149]

But scholars have also noted interest in abstract doctrine among groups of lowlier status, evidence which often presents itself in locales undergoing doctrinal controversies. Bodo Nischan has found a general

---

and 35; Thomas Robisheaux argues that in rural Hohelohe, although they accepted some of the Protestant marriage reforms because they provided mechanisms to better control the youth, the peasants were not particularly interested in the content of the new doctrine, "Peasants and pastors: rural youth control and the Reformation in Hohenlohe, 1540–1680," *Social History* 6 (1981), 281–300, here p. 282; Vogler claims that "theologische Erörterungen fanden wenig Resonanz," "Volksfrömmigkeit im Lutherthum," p. 38.

[145] This overview comes from van Dülmen, "Volksfrömmigkeit und konfessionelles Christentum," p. 26; Gerald Strauss has come to a similar conclusion. "The Reformation and its Public in an Age of Orthodoxy," in *The Germanic People and the Reformation*, ed. R. Po-Chia Hsia (Ithaca, 1988), pp. 194–214, here at p. 211.

[146] Artomedes, *Christliche Auslegung*, p. 35; see above, n. 4.

[147] Davis, "From 'Popular Religion,'" p. 217.

[148] Even Robert Scribner, who views the impact of the Reformation on the masses as a very slow protracted affair, nonetheless sees "radical" religious reform as taking place among, but confined to, literate urban elites, "Elements of Popular Belief," in *Religion and Culture*, pp. 52–82, here p. 79.

[149] Bernard Vogler, "Entstehung," pp. 158–96, here p. 192.

understanding of Eucharistic doctrine among some of the simpler folk in Brandenburg during Elector Johann Sigismund's campaign to institute the Second Reformation in his territories. There the people of Stendal, led by their clothmaker spokesman, refused to accept a pastor because of his rumored Calvinist tendencies. Their reason: Lutherans believed in the real presence, but Reformed only in the spiritual.[150] I have also found evidence of a general interest by the laity from across the social spectrum in the doctrinal issues raised by the Flacian controversy over original sin. In the territory of Mansfeld even miners and craftsmen exhibited a basic comprehension of the debate's content.[151] Clearly some Reformation doctrines were settling deeply into public consciousness during the second half of the 16th century. As mentioned above, wills begin to exhibit a Christocentric trust in God among Lutherans after 1580.[152]

Moreover, as preached to the people, Lutheranism offered more than just abstract theology and posthumous rewards, a fact that is often overshadowed by scholarly emphasis on Luther's focus on faith.[153] Sermons from this period are filled with references to the earthly advantages of living a proper Christian life and the threats of temporal punishments for failure to do so, as seen, for example, in the *Haustafel* literature. Old Testament stories and moral lessons especially appear to have resonated with the commoners and, indeed, there is evidence of Bible reading and hearing becoming an increasingly significant element of individual piety.[154] This can be seen by the marked increase of Biblical scenes and quotations on a variety of material objects owned by Lutherans from across society. Where formerly pictures of Mary and the saints were prevalent, scenes from the Bible, often ones that narrated humankind's

[150] Bodo Nischan, *Prince, People, and Confession: The Second Reformation in Brandenburg* (Philadelphia, 1994), pp. 201–02.

[151] Christman, "Heretics in Luther's Homeland," especially, pp. 380–417.

[152] Vogler, "Entstehung," pp. 181–84.

[153] Various scholars have characterized Lutheranism as replete with abstract promises for eternal salvation, but offering little help with problems of the here and now. See van Dülmen, "Volksfrömmigkeit und konfessionelles Christentum," p. 21; Karant-Nunn, *Reformation of Ritual*, p. 105.

[154] Vogler provides examples of lay references to reading the Bible, but recognizes that they provide the barest of sketches of a Bible culture, "Entstehung," pp. 184–85; he also uses printing statistics to argue for the development of a Bible culture during this period. In Strassbourg in the late 16th century, 298 of 811 evangelical works printed were the full text or parts of the Bible, a number that does not include Psalters, Bible stories, and biblical dramas, "Volksfrömmigkeit," pp. 45–46.

loss and recovery of eternal life or issues of family morality, replaced them. For example, a painting depicting the story of the prodigal son might be placed on a trunk with the family's valuables, a warning to a son of what might happen if he wasted his inheritance.[155] If one assumes that people decorated their houses with images and sayings meaningful to them, it appears that interest in the Bible and biblical morality was increasing during this period.[156]

Another fruitful line of inquiry into popular piety has explored aspects that were the result of negotiation or interplay between clerical and lay cultures.[157] Robert Scribner has argued that, "'Popular' and 'Official' Protestant belief developed in a process of mutual accommodation, passing through a succession of phases or cycles…".[158] Increasingly historians have found evidence of such negotiation. Lutherans continued to celebrate certain medieval church festivals, not because they met their standards of orthodoxy, but because they were intimately tied to the rhythms of agricultural life.[159] Even pre-Christian celebrations, such as Mayday, Whitsun, and various harvest festivals, as well as pagan Christmas customs, made their way into Lutheran practice, revealing a distinctive lay mentality strong enough to force official accommodation to this viewpoint.[160]

Another example of the laity's influence on official church piety can be seen in a medieval Regensburg tradition, banned shortly after the

---

[155] Siegfried Müller, "Repräsentationen des Luthertums—Disziplinierung und Konfessionelle Kultur in Bilder: Ein Problemaufriss anhand von Regionalen Beispielen," *Zeitschrift für historische Forschung* 29 (2002), 215–55, here at p. 243.

[156] Vogler takes the opposite view, arguing that the populace received sermons on morals with great revulsion (*äußerst ungern*), "Volksfrömmigkeit," p. 38.

[157] Heribert Smolinsky claims that many historians see the development of popular piety as an interactive exchange. "Volksfrömmigkeit als Thema der neueren Forschung. Beobachtungen und Aspecte," in *Volksfrömmigkeit in der Frühen Neuzeit*, pp. 9–16, here pp. 11–12. Robert Scribner argues for "a good deal of syncretism between the old and new forms of popular religion," "Elements of Popular Belief," p. 81; C. Scott Dixon has suggested that "Two cultures did exist in this period, and to distinguish between a 'great' and a 'little' tradition does not necessarily elide the fact that the relationship was fluid, or that one tradition shaped or modified its counterpart," "Popular Beliefs and the Reformation in Brandenburg-Ansbach," in *Popular Religion in Germany and Central Europe, 1400–1800*, ed. Robert Scribner and Trevor Johnson (New York, 1996), pp. 119–39, here at pp. 119–120.

[158] Robert Scribner, "The Impact of the Reformation on Daily Life," in *Religion and Culture*, pp. 275–301, here at p. 299.

[159] Graff uses the example of St. Martin's Day (November 11), which served to mark the end of the harvest. *Geschichte der Auflösung*, p. 127; Vogler makes this point as well, "Volksfrömmigkeit im Lutherthum," p. 47.

[160] Scribner, "Impact of the Reformation on Daily Life," pp. 281–82.

Reformation, but eventually brought back and "altered" to fit Lutheran standards. At Christmastime in Regensburg (and other churches in the region), carolers (*Göldnern*) sang in the streets to raise money for the local church buildings. Lutheran authorities initially outlawed the practice, but in 1553 gave their permission to the students at the cathedral school, and later at the nearby *Poetenschule* to sing at the burghers' houses. Apparently the combination of a desire to hear the caroling and the necessity to raise money (in this case for students) breathed new life into an outlawed medieval practice.[161] Clearly some negotiation was taking place.

Sometimes clerically established structures might be employed in the service of popular beliefs. In 1609 ecclesiastical visitors in Oldenburg chastised pastors for including "silly" requests given them by their parishioners (such as petitions that God help find lost objects) in the common prayer—a practice that the visitors claimed merely hardened the parishioners in their superstitions.[162] The people, it seems, found some advantage in having their "superstitious" petitions included in the officially sanctioned prayer, and it appears that some pastors accommodated them, a clear case of popular beliefs merging with orthodox clerical structures of worship.

Such studies of the interplay between elite and popular religious viewpoints offer an approach to popular piety that provides a more nuanced understanding of the connections and dialectic between these two worlds. Furthermore, they remind us of the fact that the gulf between pastors and parishioners was not always that great, and, in fact, that piety might be thought of as a continuum.

Finally, historians have discovered a great deal of continuity between the beliefs and behaviors of the laity in the late Middle Ages and the early modern period.[163] Despite their best efforts Lutheran churchmen

---

[161] Christoph Daxelmüller, "Volksfrömmigkeit im Reformationszeitalter—Epochschwelle oder Kontinuität (am Beispiel Regensburgs)," in *Reformation und Reichstadt: Protestantische Leben in Regensburg*, ed. Hans Schwarz (Regensburg, 1994), pp. 101–133, here p. 118.

[162] *Kirchenordnungen*, 7,2,1:1179, 1198.

[163] Robert Scribner has been most influential in arguing for the view that popular religion in Catholic and Lutheran Germany diverged slowly and incompletely. Establishing a new worldview among the laity, he believes, took centuries, as indicated by the chronological parameters of his studies, 1400–1800, many of which have been collected in the volume *Religion and Culture in Germany, 1400–1800*. For more examples of the continuities in popular religion see Dixon, *Reformation and rural society*, pp. 176–93.

were unable to eliminate a multitude of popular beliefs and practices.[164] Beliefs in sacred places, times, and objects remained prevalent. The cemetery was a *locus sacer*, a liminal area where two worlds met.[165] One historian has concluded that a powerful relationship between the living and the dead continued.[166] Church space and objects within the church retained sacral power, as did certain church festivals and even times of the day.[167] Objects such as Bibles and prayers were thought to have protective powers while the sign of the cross remained a potent gesture to ward off evil.[168] These examples demonstrate the variety of opportunities not sanctioned by the church that remained for addressing the supernatural world.[169]

In many places forms of healing that the church considered superstitious, and other uses of magic, remained untouched.[170] Lists of questions asked by visitors invariably included inquiries as to who had consulted healers and magicians, and visitation reports give ample evidence of continued practice. In Prussia such activities were prevalent enough to be included as one of six reasons one might be called before the consistory.[171] In other areas, often rural or mountainous, such practices remained entrenched, sometimes into the 18th century.[172] However, in

---

[164] What follows is by no means an exhaustive list. One might also look at the continuation of both Catholic and pre-Christian popular beliefs and practices such as Marian piety and veneration of the saints; belief in witchcraft and other forms of supernatural powers; consecration of various places and objects; continuation of pilgrimages; and persistence of rituals associated with childbirth and burials, to name only a few.

[165] Vogler, "Entstehung," p. 172; Scribner, "Elements of Popular Belief," p. 61.

[166] Scribner, "Impact," p. 294.

[167] Ibid., pp. 286–87.

[168] Ibid., p. 287.

[169] Lang, "Ein Grobes, Unbändiges Volk," p. 60.

[170] Vogler makes the point that because all of our sources on the matter are clerical, it is difficult to tell whether such practices were the norm or practiced by only a small minority. "Entstehung," p. 160; Scribner argues that structural similarities regarding sacrality between Catholic and Lutheran thought and practice made it extremely difficult for Lutheran authorities to rid the folk of the use of magic and healing, "The Reformation, Popular Magic, and the 'Disenchantment of the World,'" in *The German Reformation. The Essential Readings*, ed. C. Scott Dixon (Oxford, 1999), pp. 262–79.

[171] *Kirchenordnungen*, 4:97.

[172] Eva Labouvie has examined popular responses to official efforts to eradicate folk magic and demonstrated why the churchmen had such difficulties. Many people did not consider the use of folk magic to be a sin. Others used 'Christian means' first, and when they failed, tried traditional methods. Or they claimed that such folk magic, when successful, was the result of God's help, "Wider Wahrsagerei, Segnerei und Zauberei. Kirchliche Versuche zur Ausgrenzung von Aberglaube und Volksmagie seit dem 16. Jahrhundert," in *Verbrechen, Strafen, und soziale Kontrolle*, ed. Richard van Dülmen (Frankfurt/M., 1990), pp. 15–55, esp. 38–41.

some areas, such as the Rhine Valley, evidence of these practices vanishes from the written sources after 1580.[173] In Württemberg likewise the use of magic was seldom noted, and when mentioned, consisted primarily of folk healing practices. This infrequency may be due to the visitors' rather tolerant view of magic and superstition, which, as Bruce Tolley has suggested, "do not constitute evidence of a vigorous folk religion or a religious counterculture at odds with the ideology of the Lutheran Reformation".[174] Indeed, local churchmen allowed many of these practices to continue.[175]

By all official accounts, blasphemy and swearing remained common, as most visitation reports mention the presence of at least one blasphemer (*Gotteslasterer*) in every parish. Often soldiers, millers, and other marginal groups were accused of blasphemy, frequently coupled with failure to take part in official church practices.[176] Religious indifference was likewise widespread. Those who exhibited it were labeled "despisers of the preaching of God's Word and the most worthy sacrament".[177] Most Christians, it seems, believed in life after death, but for many, the prospect does not appear to have been particularly important.[178] What this indifference meant is unclear, but it has been speculated that for some it may have been a form of passive resistance[179] or a signal of the presence of clandestine Anabaptism.[180] Often the poor and shepherds belonged to this group.[181]

Increasing nuance will undoubtedly be added to this general sketch. However, beliefs, practices, and behaviors outside the ken of the official church clearly remained, particularly in rural areas, which encompassed the vast majority of German-speaking Lutheran lands and populations. Such a view coincides with evidence from the church ordinances that demonstrates that opportunities to learn Lutheran ideas, as well as disciplinary oversight, made their presence felt more intensively in the cities.

---

[173] Vogler, "Entstehung," pp. 160–61.
[174] Tolley, *Pastors and Parishioners*, p. 72.
[175] Lang, "'Ein Grobes, Unbändiges Volk,'" p. 59.
[176] Vogler, "Entstehung," p. 178.
[177] The Prussian Church ordinance includes this sin as one of six that required citation before the consistory. *Kirchenordnungen*, 4:97–98.
[178] Vogler, "Entstehung," pp. 179–80.
[179] Sometimes this resistance could be overt. Lang has found that in cases when the local pastor enforced his views and official discipline too stringently, people responded by interrupting sermons, yelling at him in the streets, or sticking their tongues out at him, "'Ein Grobes, Unbändiges Volk,'" pp. 60–61.
[180] Vogler, "Entstehung," p. 180.
[181] Ibid., p. 181.

Conclusion

Between 1550 and 1619 the churchmen's efforts to mold their parishioners into believing and practicing Lutherans were characterized by defining, tailoring, augmenting, and refining their expectations for a life of faith, the means by which they articulated their message, and the modes they used to enforce norms of belief and behavior. Although the foundation had been laid during the first decades of the Reformation, significant expansion came after mid-century.

As demonstrated by the explosion of *Haustafel* literature, Lutheran clerics defined norms of Christian behavior ever more specifically according to estate and calling. A life of faith was to be the outgrowth of law and gospel as explicated in the catechism, and one such life might look very different from another. Living one's faith meant executing one's divine calling as defined by a series of relationships specific to that vocation. Thus, for example, a father had specific responsibilities to his pastor, ruler, wife, children, and servants, responsibilities that from the perspective of the clerics, established the proper relationship between individuals in these callings.

This emphasis on vocation not only helped to delineate expectations more clearly; it provided the churchmen with a means by which to oblige parishioners to proper behavior and belief. For Lutherans salvation did not come as the result of good works and proper actions on earth, but of faith. As critics of the Reformation opined from the very beginning, this understanding of salvation left the door open to lawlessness and chaos. Why act properly if salvation was independent from behavior? By emphasizing the concept of vocation, a divine call to one's position in the family and society, clerics reaffirmed the necessity of proper action, holding out the promise of God's temporal and eternal rewards or the threat of punishment.

Lutheran churchmen also augmented and refined the array of means developed to instill proper belief and behavior in their parishioners. Overt opportunities for education (church services, schools, and catechism classes) became increasingly specific to various social groups and were defined to meet each group's needs. To the sacraments and rites of the church were added educational components so that each official interaction between the clerics and the laity became a pedagogical opportunity. Often these points of contact were one on one—in confession, prior to acting as sponsor to a child, before marrying, at the deathbed. Pastors and their message were integrated deeply into the life of the individual.

Means and methods of enforcing Lutheran ideals of proper behavior and norms of belief were institutionalized, expanded, and fine-tuned. Churchmen, acting in their pastoral role as guardians of their parishioners' souls and executors of Christian discipline, admonished, reprimanded, and punished their charges. Because their goals coincided with the early modern state's desire to produce obedient and docile subjects, princes and city councils increasingly supported the churchmen in their efforts, offering financial resources and coercive force, and even taking over some aspects of the control of morals entirely.

Much debate surrounds the impact of these efforts by the churchmen. Some scholars have argued that for the vast majority of laity, these efforts were stillborn. The common man remained wedded to a late-medieval belief system that combined Catholic and pre-Christian elements and was characterized by superstitions and magic-based solutions to everyday problems. Evidence for this view abounds in references to magicians, healers, communication with the dead, and sacred objects, places, and times, all of which fall outside the bounds of Lutheran orthodox belief.

While for a significant portion of the population of the German-speaking Lutheran lands, this may have been their experience of religion, there is powerful evidence that this was not the rule for all. Results are by no means clear, but scholars have found considerable evidence of the impact of the churchmen's campaign. The number of parishioners attending church rose during this period, often reaching acceptable levels. Meaningful understanding of increasingly complex Lutheran doctrine, as expressed in catechetical texts,[182] seems scarce, but there is evidence, especially in the cities, of a more general comprehension of basic Lutheran doctrine, and local studies have shown interest in it from across the social spectrum. A few of these studies have demonstrated that individual churchmen were highly successful in establishing a vibrant parishioner piety. Knowledge of the catechism increased over the period in question although a gap between memorization and true understanding appears to have remained for many. The churchmen had more success in their efforts to instill some sense of biblical morality, as many of the laity appear to have taken an interest in the stories of the Bible and the messages they articulated.[183]

---

[182] See essay V above.

[183] Vogler sums it up as follows: There were three groups—the first, a minority of

Increasingly, however, any model of acculturation, of a dominant view of proper belief and behavior overwhelming and reshaping a subservient one, is becoming untenable. Examples of a negotiated piety, a dynamic one that incorporated both clerical and folk ideas and practices, seems closer to the reality of the situation. Some folk beliefs and behaviors clearly fell outside the parameters acceptable to the Lutheran churchmen, many more than had been the case in the late Middle Ages. In other words, Lutheran churchmen, with the support of the state, insisted on more precise beliefs and better behavior. Nonetheless, the people did not sit by powerlessly and simply accept these new standards. Not only did they oblige the cultural elites to tolerate aspects of their culture, but many of these elements were incorporated into officially defined and acceptable piety. Future studies will undoubtedly add nuance to this dynamic process and its consequences.

notables in each congregation who made the belief their own; second, a minority of atheists, or close to it, individuals who never took part; third, a majority who wanted the simplest way to heaven who conformed because of tradition, not out of personal devotion. "Entstehung," pp. 194–195.

THE SOCIAL IMPACT OF THE LUTHERAN REFORMATION IN GERMANY

Susan R. Boettcher

Readers of *Der Stechlin* (1899), a classic work by German novelist Theodor Fontane, may be aware that some female cloisters survived the Reformation in evangelical territories: the protagonist's aunt, Adelheid, the *Domina* or presiding officer of such an institution, vocalizes in her advice to her brother and nephew the continued value of tradition in the face of rapid social change.[1] In fact, a few—although not those in Brandenburg, where Fontane set his story—are still operating today. Nowadays, these institutions are called *Damenstifte*, or "ladies' foundations," a word also used to describe medieval female cloisters. The best-known are located in Lower Saxony and Schleswig-Holstein.[2] Only one such institution was newly founded in the 16th century[3] although German Lutheran groups later reformulated some ideals of female religious life in the female diaconate.[4] The cloisters are largely unknown outside their regions today. The narrative of their persistence despite the apparent self-contradiction with which their existence confronts us offers important insights about the interaction of Lutheranism as

I thank Landessuperintendent i.R. Volker Jürgens for helpful conversations pursuant to the completion of this essay and the staff of the Herzog August Bibliothek Wolfenbüttel for their assistance. Footnotes are not meant to be exhaustive but rather to send the reader to a few relevant, easily accessible, or recent sources for further reading. For reasons of space subtitles are omitted.

[1] Theodor Fontane, *Der Stechlin: Roman. Kritische Ausgabe* (Frankfurt/M, 1998).

[2] Nicolaus Heutger, *Die evangelischen Frauenstifte und -klöster in Niedersachsen* (Braunschweig, 1998). A map is found in Annette von Boetticher, "Chorfrauen und evangelische Damenstifte," in *Orden und Klöster im Zeitalter von Reformation und katholischer Reform 1500–1700*, ed. Friedhelm Jürgensmeier and Regine Elisabeth Schwerdtfeger (Münster, 2005), 1:217–42. See also the list of institutions administered by the Klosterkammer Hannover, http://www.klosterkammer.de/start.html (Accessed August 20, 2007). Administrative arrangements varied drastically; for example, Westphalian foundations were multiconfessional and alternated prioresses of different faiths.

[3] The Marschallsche Stiftung, founded in 1592 in Wasungen, a Wettin area; von Boetticher, "Chorfrauen," p. 239.

[4] Ute Gause, *Kirchengeschichte und Genderforschung* (Tübingen, 2006), pp. 163–254; *Kosmos Diakonissenmutterhaus*, eds. idem and Cordula Lissner (Leipzig, 2005); Silke Köser, *Denn eine Diakonisse darf kein Alltagsmensch sein* (Leipzig, 2006).

a body of beliefs and ideas with the concrete circumstances of early modern society. Their continued existence was both a result and symbol of the political, legal, and social relationships that Lutheranism encountered in Old Regime Germany, matters that it was not always disposed to or capable of changing. The gaps between theology, law, implementation, and response, along with the feedback between these various levels and the path dependency of their institutional trajectories, complicate attempts to elucidate the social outcomes of the Lutheran Reformation.

When a territory in the Holy Roman Empire officially instituted a Reformation, its religious communities and corporations were often, but not always, either dissolved or prevented from accepting new members. What happened depended on the relative political power of the person initiating the dissolution vis-à-vis the institution, its legal status, its political and social functions, and the ability of its members to marshal resistance.[5] Many communities were simply unable to muster the necessary political influence to continue; the most notorious case, because its members were so literate and active in their self-defense, is the Franciscan female convent of St. Clare outside of Nuremberg, but there were many others.[6] Some corporations persisted with new names or memberships but similar functions: the Magdeburg cathedral chapter, for example, closed the cathedral for twenty years after Albrecht of Brandenburg's death. Its subsequent membership re-opened it with an evangelical service in 1567.[7]

Many, indeed most, female convents in Lutheran territories were dissolved, but activities in surviving communities were reframed by new ordinances (*Klosterordnungen*) developed and promulgated by sovereigns and their legal and theological advisers. These ordinances reveal that, as in the Middle Ages and even in normative terms, organization and

---

[5] Barbara Henze, "Orden und ihre Klöster in der Umbruchszeit der Konfessionalisierung," in *Die Territorien des Reichs im Zeitalter der Reformation und der Konfessionalisierung*, ed. Anton Schindling and Matthias Asche (Münster, 1997), 7:91–105.

[6] For older literature, Andrea Christmann, *Autorinnen der Frühen Neuzeit. Katharina Schütz-Zell und Caritas Pirckheimer* (dissertation, Universität Mannheim, 2004), at http://madoc.bib.uni-mannheim.de/madoc/volltexte/2005/859/pdf/AndreaCH.pdf (Accessed August 22, 2007). Older editions of Caritas Pirckheimer's writings, edited by Josef Pfanner, are supplemented by materials in *Willibald Pirckheimers Briefwechsel*, eds. Emil Reicke et al. (Munich, 1940–2006). For a perspective on Nuremberg from a different cloister, see Barbara Steinke, *Paradiesgarten oder Gefängnis? Das Nürnberger Katharinenkloster zwischen Klosterreform und Reformation* (Tübingen, 2006).

[7] Erich Weber, *Das Domkapital von Magdeburg bis 1567* (Halle, 1912).

everyday varied from house to house. Sometimes the supervisor was renamed *Domina*, while elsewhere she kept the title abbess (*Äbtissin*) or was called *Priorin* or *Oberin*. Offices common in medieval communities (sacristan, pharmacist, liturgist) survived, but houses surrendered the right to conduct their own economic affairs to secular officials. New statutes forbade the mass and veneration of the saints and insisted that the women be instructed in the new faith; their spiritual advisers were now Lutheran pastors and preachers. These institutions gradually lost their properties and income. While some were stripped of their treasures, others continued to preserve important objects: medieval art and libraries sometimes remained untouched.

Entrants after the Reformation no longer took monastic vows but were still expected to follow standards based on the ideals of obedience, chastity, and poverty. Sources continued to refer to them as *Konventualinnen* or *Stiftsdamen*. Many communities, while no longer calling themselves Benedictine, Cistercian, Augustinian, or Franciscan, continued to observe portions of their former rules at least until the end of the 17th century, because ordinances required them to do so. The *Damenstifte* of Schleswig, for example, marked the hours until they were abolished by royal ordinance in 1777. Many members continued to wear habits, which evolved into *Trachten* eventually worn only on special occasions. Regulations about private property were relaxed, however, to allow sisters individual jewelry, books, devotional objects, or cooking utensils. Communal sleeping—probably the largest aggravation of monastic life—was eliminated quickly. Women received individual apartments (or in some cases, houses), purchased by families that obtained the hereditary right to place a member in the community. Individual apartments generally had separate kitchens, so that the women gradually dispensed with communal meals. By the 18th century *Stiftsdamen* typically had maids or companions and regular visitors. They were free to leave the institution, although complaints about absent sisters were frequent. Their carefully-cultivated traditional gardens have recently become the object of interest among researchers.[8] In some, the *Konventualinnen* cultivated fine handicrafts, as in Kloster Medingen, for example, which produced lace for ritual and private consumption.[9] Some supported schools for girls, children of the elites from which their membership

[8] Inken Formann, *Vom Gardenlandt so den Conventualinnen gehört* (Munich, 2006).
[9] Erika Ziemer, *Historische Spitze im Kloster Medingen* (Bad Bevensen, 2004).

was drawn. At Kloster Ebstorf the ladies did both.[10] Some corporations provided poor relief.[11]

All of the communities shrank in size, sometimes by as much as three-quarters; after the Reformation they were open solely to women from social groups whose families could confirm the requisite number of noble ancestors and/or pay entrance fees.[12] These women were supported by incomes tied directly to places in the cloister.[13] Socially, as among medieval religious, *Stift* membership entitled them to positions in court protocol, in some cases higher than those of their families of origin. The significance of such ranks is revealed by the Prussian practice of nominating women to cloisters that no longer existed, as in the case of *Stift* Keppel after the Napoleonic Wars, and via the awarding of orders of merit associated with the cloisters. The result was the exclusion of other social groups, even women from working families who previously had been able to participate actively in cloister life. Tertiaries or lay sisters who conducted the rough work of the communities before the Reformation in order to support the religious life of full-fledged sisters were replaced by servants who worked for wages rather than religious merit.

The most well-known surviving communities today are administered through the Klosterfonds Hannover, an endowment under public law. The Calenberg cloisters survived because Elisabeth of Calenberg-Göttingen subjected confiscated cloister properties to a separate administrative body rather than subsuming them in her state treasury. The Lüneburg cloisters had pre-Reformation constitutions according to which only part of their property was held in a secular endowment, so when Ernst von Braunschweig-Lüneburg introduced the Reformation in 1521, he was legally able to seize the provost's share but not convent-owned properties. Moreover, the territorial nobility intervened because of their historic investments in the cloisters, which had housed their surplus children throughout the Middle Ages. Such action occurred wherever female cloisters survived; in contrast, convents most open to commoners were less successful in preserving themselves because

---

[10] Hanna Dose, *Evangelischer Klosteralltag. Leben in Lüneburger Frauenkonventen 1590–1710 untersucht am Beispiel Ebstorf* (Hannover, 1994), pp. 230–33.

[11] Heutger, *Frauenstifte*, pp. 128–33.

[12] von Boetticher, "Chorfrauen," p. 228.

[13] Formann, *Gardenlandt*, pp. 84–108.

the nobility did not interfere as forcefully in their fates.[14] Gender considerations also played a role: In Mecklenburg, for example, in 1552 the Lutheran dukes forbade male but not female communities from accepting new novices. Evangelical male religious communities (such as the Teutonic Knights, which after 1648 accepted members of all three confessions, or the *Johanniterorden*) were rarer.[15] Both were military orders; to my knowledge, no traditional male coenobitic communities became evangelical cloisters. The continued existence of these communities points to the inability (and perhaps, in some cases, lacking desire) of Reformation-era sovereigns simply to wipe out pre-existing political and social arrangements. It is thus significant that they often vanished during political watersheds rather than during periods of stable sovereignty.[16]

While the surviving *Damenstifte* are healthy—some espouse a revived Lutheran meditative piety and serve as centers of meditation and spiritual care, and their income supports not only members but also a broad spectrum of charitable, cultural, and scholarly activities—no one would claim that the piety they reflect constitutes a significant element of modern (Lutheran) German life. The opinion that their persistence was a coherent attempt at reformulating an evangelical ideal for female religious life[17] is contested by the virtual absence of new institutions during or after the Reformation. But they point to an initial answer to questions about the social impact of Lutheranism: the translation of social ideas and ideals into practice was a complex, often difficult process that succeeded primarily in situations where legal obstacles were not only surmountable, minimal or non-existent, but also where multiple interests coincided in establishing the desired transformation.

Thus, although recent scholarly trends have emphasized the causal role of confession in early modern political and governmental developments, evidence from the social realm suggests that with a few exceptions,

---

[14] Christopher Bauer, "Reichsritterschaft in Franken," in *Territorien des Reichs*, 4:182–213, p. 191.

[15] On the very complex fate of the Teutonic Knights during and after the Reformation, see Dieter J. Weiß, "Deutscher Orden," in *Territorien des Reichs*, 6:224–48. On the Johanniter, Walter G. Rödel, "Der Johanniterorden," in *Orden und Kloster*, 1:141–59.

[16] Hans Peter Hankel, *Die reichsunmittelbaren evangelischen Damenstifte im Alten Reich und ihr Ende* (Frankfurt/M, 1996).

[17] Lucia Koch, "'Eingezogenes stilles Wesen'? Protestantische Damenstifte an der Wende zum 17. Jahrhundert," in "*In Christo ist weder man noch Weyb*", ed. Anne Conrad (Münster, 1999), pp. 199–230.

Lutheranism was a cause for change only in a few areas. Certainly, some of these changes were incompletely realized; others were unanticipated or even unintended. Moreover, as the *Damenstifte* remind us, meanings and functions of social developments could change, so that beliefs, institutions, and practices with a particular significance at their institution could have an entirely different impact in a later context. Problems with sorting out the relationship between theological ideas and their social outcomes drove a great deal of the research on the social consequences of Lutheranism among scholars who struggled after the mid-19th century to define the relationship between the Reformation and modernity. Research since the 1970s, however, suggests that Lutheranism enjoyed a much more modest effect on most areas of society than the initial claims of much earlier scholarship asserted.

Definitions, Problems and Difficulties in the Social History of Lutheranism

The problem behind this essay is the extent to which the at times less-than-coherent body of teachings and beliefs we call "Lutheranism" caused developments in the concrete realm of material circumstances, social structures, society, and everyday life in the 16th and 17th centuries. In the past social historians often addressed this question in terms of the "impact" or "successes and failures of the Reformation;"[18] recently, the approach has been expanded into the longer term impacts of the emergence of confessions in Germany.[19] The question has been easier to formulate than to answer. Early debates over "success and failure," hugely charged terms, gave rise to a tension between historical theologians and social historians (especially in North America) that even now has not completely abated. Although the tension is sometimes ascribed to alleged political differences in the two fields—social historians have often been interested in "history from below" while historical theologians typically study ideas and culture that originate among elites—scholars

[18] Gerald Strauss, *Luther's House of Learning* (Baltimore, 1978); idem, "Success and Failure in the German Reformation," *Past and Present* 67 (1975), 30–63; James Kittelson, "Successes and Failures in the German Reformation: The Report from Strasbourg," *ARG* 73 (1982), 153–74; idem, "Visitations and Popular Religious Culture," in *Pietas and Societas*, ed. Kyle C. Sessions and Phillip N. Bebb (Kirksville, 1985), pp. 89–102.

[19] Geoffrey Parker, "Success and Failure during the First Century of the Reformation," *Past & Present* 136 (1992), 43–82.

who wish to avoid unproductive polemic should avoid mischaracterizing their interlocutors' positions. Rather, we should note that the emphasis of social history on treating the messy social world and the confusing situation on the ground rather than theological visions of society and social arrangements contrasts with the tendency of some historical theology or intellectual history to ascribe precise essential meanings to the works of certain thinkers or limit the correct interpretations of theological developments from a perspective internal to the theology itself. While some historical theologians would deny that a social phenomenon that results from an allegedly incorrect understanding of a theology should be ascribed causally to that theology, most social historians would contest the idea that a theology or its interpreters can completely or effectively control a theology's social meanings. The result is that on extreme ends of the debate, some historical theologians would suggest that the more radical popular responses to Luther's writings are at most related to Lutheranism as a misunderstanding of it, while some social historians would deny that Lutheranism had an essential stance apart from how contemporaries perceived and reacted to it.

This fundamental perspectival divergence means that practitioners of the two fields may experience difficulty in speaking to each other, especially when they use common categories with different meanings in each context. Calls in the 1980s for a "social history of ideas" as a means of understanding the effects of the Reformation and uniting both bodies of knowledge thus ultimately meant quite different things in the mouths of different researchers; for Heiko A. Oberman, this activity could be conducted primarily by treating traditional sources of intellectual history in light of their social origins, whereas Erik Midelfort urged social historians focused on the traditional sources for social histories to familiarize themselves with theological and printed sources as a means of understanding how theologies were remade in the hands of their popular practitioners.[20] Rather than assuming that these groups will talk past each other as they often have, however, we as researchers should use the tension between the two fields more productively than it has been, as a source of creative energy in the field and as a basis for trying to understand and incorporate each other's claims in our own

[20] Heiko A. Oberman, *Masters of the Reformation* (Cambridge, 1981); H.C. Erik Midelfort, "Toward a Social History of Ideas in the German Reformation," in *Pietas et Societas*, ed. Kyle C. Sessions and Phillip N. Bebb (Kirksville, 1985), pp. 11–21.

thinking. This section of the essay attempts to take a first (but hardly a final) step in that direction by explicit assessment of the utility of certain theological and historical concepts in the realm of social history. Social historians have often experienced difficulty in employing certain terms in the same sense as historical theologians do, which complicates the task of determining the social effects of the Lutheran Reformation in a way that will be credible for both groups.

The first difficulty social historians confront is that the inexactness of the religious category "Lutheran" (*evangelisch*) complicates assignments of causality. Thus the term "social history of Lutheranism" is something of a misnomer. Doctrinal standards or other boundaries important to theologians are not useful for defining the term because this classification refers to primarily to matters outside the social realm. Even in its 16th-century usages, where it relates primarily to theology, doctrine, and law, it does not always have clear boundaries; if the various pieces of the Augsburg Confession became standard because they were used to define Lutherans legally for the purposes of the Peace of Augsburg,[21] still many ostensibly Lutheran sovereigns declined to subscribe to the Formula of Concord.[22] Much social history of the Reformation focuses on its first decades, before the confessions had begun to crystallize, so that measuring the effect of a particular belief system was even more difficult.

Moreover, while we can sometimes pinpoint the relationship between doctrine and legal arrangements, early modern social historians, who have been unwilling to accept that theologies promulgated in pamphlets, catechisms, and pulpits were simply accepted or understood verbatim by their audiences, nonetheless have not yet developed a method that might serve as a convincing barometer of the penetration of belief into a society. The most typical source used for measuring and evaluating the beliefs of the "common man," as the historiography terms him, is the visitation protocol, but for all their usefulness in providing a picture of the results of the Reformation "on the ground," the obvious biases and gaps in this genre of source (as a document about subjects created by authorities) have been called into question.[23] They reveal not

[21] Axel Gotthardt, *Der Augsburger Religionsfrieden* (Münster, 2004), pp. 218–20; Martin Heckel, *Deutschland im konfessionellen Zeitalter* (Göttingen, 1983), pp. 45–55.

[22] Irene Dingel, *Concordia Controversa* (Gütersloh, 1996); *Handbuch der Dogmen- und Theologiegeschichte*, ed. Carl Andresen (Göttingen, 1998), 2:84–85.

[23] Most recently in Christopher Brown, *Singing the Gospel* (Cambridge, MA, 2005).

so much the "failure" of the Reformation as the frustrations of the evangelical visitors. It is thus difficult to determine, given the sources available, whether the behavior of average "Lutherans" reflected their beliefs or rather attempts to please (or hinder) authorities. When it comes to matters like religious violence, which is typically seen as an index of the reception of a particular theology, it is nonetheless risky to assess religious conviction among the vast majority of silent onlookers or people who do not show up in relevant records because they did not participate. To surmount this difficulty many social historians have turned to anthropological approaches that evaluate behavior independently of purported intent; recent approaches within the field of religious studies that address this problem by calling for a fundamental re-examination of the utility of the term "religion" have not yet been employed in this area.[24] As a means of measuring the reception of a theology, however, both of these methods tend toward a retreat from explicit articulations of theologies themselves, and all make it difficult to understand such phenomena as crypto-Protestantism.[25]

Because of these problems, the comparative approach of a growing amount of modern scholarship conceives of Protestant confessional positions as shadings of a general concept.[26] In this light we must ask just how much the subtle ideas that separate (in particular) Lutheranism and Calvinism really affected social arrangements. Some of the most significant dividing lines between these groups, such as beliefs about the Eucharist, had little material social outcome except in separating people during the performance of the sacraments.[27] Other dividing lines, such

[24] Talal Asad, *Genealogies of Religion* (Baltimore, 1993), Timothy Fitzgerald, *The Ideology of Religious Studies* (Oxford, 2003).

[25] See, however, *Staatsmacht und Seelenheil*, ed. Rudolf Leeb et al. (Vienna, 2007). Crypto-religion among Calvinists has been closely examined, perhaps because Calvin condemned it so vehemently.

[26] E.g., Euan Cameron, *The European Reformation* (Oxford, 1991).

[27] Although some social historians initially questioned whether the "common man" understood anything about theology, the current consensus position suggests that broad theological divisions were understood, especially if they affected ritual practice. Thus teachings on images, on certain loci of controversy during the adiaphoristic controversy such as vestments, and on broad sacramental differences between Lutheranism and Calvinism such as the elimination of the formula of exorcism in Calvinist baptisms or different teachings on the Eucharist, were probably broadly understood. Their more complex permutations (such as the vehement Christological controversies of later 16th century Lutheranism and between Lutherans and Calvinists) were probably only accessible to theologians and some very educated members of the urban patriciate. A useful discussion of popular reactions to religious change from Lutheranism to Calvinist is Bodo Nischan, *Prince, People, and Confession: The Second Reformation in Brandenburg*

as teachings on free will, salvation, and divine Providence, have been diagnosed as significant for later social developments. Still, insofar as their theologies are relatively similar, Calvinism and Lutheranism may not differ strongly in their social effects. It seems reasonable to assume that the vast majority of social outcomes of the Reformation, if they can be attributed to confessional difference at all, are more likely to have stemmed originally from the split with the Old Church rather than from later-16th- or 17th-century doctrine.

Thus, from the perspective of social history, it is most useful to think of "Lutherans" as inhabitants of particular geopolitical zones where rulers established Lutheran churches. Such Lutherans lived in a variety of economic landscapes and political units in central Europe. They were grouped in different political statuses and privileges, as quasi-serfs tied to particular lands, as citizens of free imperial cities, subjects of territorial states, or direct subjects of the emperor. In some settings they lived exclusively, while in others, Lutheranism was only one faith among others. In those areas, especially, we might speak of "Lutheran identity," a self-identification with the confession in response to a situation with different options.[28] This essay concerns inhabitants of German-speaking lands.[29] Still, even with this mechanical definition, the amazing diversity of beliefs and landscapes, traditions, and laws in their areas of settlement make it difficult to identify Lutheranism as the sufficient factor in any social change. Moreover, we now speak of multiple Reformations rather than a single event at a discreet moment. The legal introduction of Lutheranism happened in different places at substantially different times over three human generations;[30] some social elements (e.g., the emergence of consistories) influenced each other

(Philadelphia, 1994), although this reseach underlines the problem that we are unable to measure religious sentiment except in terms of concrete phenomena such as religious violence. Nischan's work in general tends to suggest that it was the ritual aspect of religious change, as much as or more than the theological factors, that provoked popular unrest.

[28] For demonstrations of such identity in church spaces and rituals, see Frauke Volkland, *Konfession und Selbstverständnis* (Göttingen, 2005), who, however, contests the notion of "confessional identity" in her "Konfession, Konversion und soziales Drama," in *Interkonfessionalität-Transkonfessionalität-binnenkonfessionelle Pluralität. Neue Forschungen zur Konfessionalisierugsthese*, ed. Kaspar von Greyerz et al. (Gütersloh, 2003), pp. 91–104.

[29] On defining "Germany," see Tom Scott, *Society and Economy in Germany, 1300–1600* (Basingstoke, 2002), pp. 6–13.

[30] Anton Schindling, "Konfessionalisierung und die Grenzen der Konfessionalisierbarkeit," in *Territorien des Reichs*, 7:20–23.

cross-confessionally, and dynastic, cultural, political, and geographical exchanges played important roles in determining the expression of Lutheranism in different settings.[31]

The view of "Lutheranism" that plays down its potentially distinctive qualities has been intensified by the emergence of the confessionalization thesis.[32] Drawing upon the work of Gerhard Oestreich and formulated simultaneously by Heinz Schilling and Wolfgang Reinhard in the 1980s, this field examines the increasing tendency of authorities to meld their priorities with those of the developing confessional churches to strengthen the state and "carry out" the Reformation. One outcome attributed to this alliance is increased control of individual behavior akin to Norbert Elias's "civilizing process," which Oestreich termed "social disciplining".[33] In several important works on Calvinist territories, Heinrich Richard Schmidt has suggested that increased social control was not imposed solely by state and church but responded to popular wishes.[34] Among the most prominent features of the confessionalization thesis has been its insistence (in response to stalled terminological debates about naming Calvinist and Catholic developments) on the parallel nature of confessional developments. The outcome has been to suggest, insofar as it automatically defines Lutherans as subjects of a Lutheran sovereign, to make them seem more like Calvinists or Catholics and lessen the relevance of theological or ritual distinctions

---

[31] Dieter Stievermann, "Evangelische Territorien im Konfessionalisierungsprozeß," in *Territorien des Reichs*, 7:45–65, pp. 53–55.

[32] For an advanced introduction, see Stefan Ehrenpreis and Ute Lotz-Heumann, *Reformation und konfessionelles Zeitalter* (Darmstadt, 2002), and the commentaries on the book and paradigm in Susan R. Boettcher, ed., H-German Forum, "Confessionalization," at http://www.h-net.org/~german/discuss/Confessionalization/Confess_index.htm (Accessed August 21, 2007). Its development is also given in Susan R. Boettcher, "Confessionalization: Reformation, Religion, Absolutism and Modernity," *History Compass* 2/1 (2004).

[33] See Gerhard Oestreich, *Neostoicism and the Early Modern State* (Cambridge, 1982) and Winfried Schulze, "Gerhard Oestreichs Begriff 'Sozialdisziplinierung in der frühen Neuzeit'," *Zeitschrift für Historische Forschung* 20 (1987), 265–302. The social disciplining literature on Germany and Lutheran territories developed in isolation from Foucault; see Martin Dinges, "The Reception of Michel Foucault's Ideas on Social Discipline, Mental Asylums, Hospitals, and the Medical Profession in German Historiography," in *Reassessing Foucault. Power, Medicine, and the Body*, ed. Colin Jones and Roy Porter (London, 1994), pp. 183–212. On Elias's significance, Gerd Schwerhoff, "Zivilisationsprozeß und Geschichtswissenschaft. Norbert Elias' Forschungsparadigma in historischer Sicht," *HZ* 266 (1998), 329–47.

[34] Heinrich Richard Schmidt, "Sozialdisziplinierung? Ein Plädoyer für das Ende des Etatismus in der Konfessionalisierungsforschung," *HZ* 265 (1997), 639–82.

for understanding subjects interacting in society. In light of these factors, we are compelled to ask: was there a specifically "Lutheran society"? Were the experiences of Lutherans in the social world different from those of Catholics, Calvinists, Anabaptists and Spiritualists, or even Muslims or Jews? Originally, confessionalization was assumed to apply only to members of the three confessions, but recent research identifies similar processes among "radical" and even non-Christian groups.[35] It may thus make more sense to speak of "confessional society," in which members of different religious groups were divided more strongly by their ostensible beliefs and perhaps their ritual practices than by the social outcomes of differing doctrine.

In response to this consensus, Thomas Kaufmann has called for a focus on the *propria* of the confessions, the matters that make them uniquely identifiable as separate groups.[36] But a number of intellectual matters stand in the way of fulfilling this agenda in the social realm. First, the predominant model of social transformation in most contemporary Reformation historiography has been influenced by structuralist anthropology and resulted in a portrait of continuity and slow change. If Lutheranism had significant effects on society, a number of the most visible *propria* may have appeared only after 1650 or even later. Social historians have isolated medieval antecedents for a number of matters traditionally attributed to the Reformation, so they are likely to assert that the Reformation provided impetus to certain developments rather than causing them.[37] This reluctance to root origins in the Reformation has been enhanced by interest in the work of sociologist Michel Foucault, which draws on the ideas of Friedrich

---

[35] Michael Driedger, *Obedient Heretics?* (Aldershot, 2002); idem, "The Intensification of Religious Commitment. Jews, Anabaptists, Radical Reform, and Confessionalization," in *Jews, Judaism and the Reformation in 16th-Century Germany*, ed. Dean Phillip Bell and Stephen G. Burnett (Leiden, 2006), pp. 269–99; Gerhard Lauer, "Die Konfessionalisierung des Judentums—Zum Prozeß der religiösen Ausdifferenzierung im Judentum am Übergang zur Neuzeit," in *Interkonfessionalität*, pp. 250–83.

[36] Thomas Kaufmann, "Die Konfessionalisierung von Kirche und Gesellschaft," *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 121 (1996), 1008–25, 1112–21.

[37] Three examples: on medieval growth of patriarchal ideology, Robert J. Bast, *Honor Your Fathers* (Leiden, 1997); on the medieval move toward increasingly organized, bureaucratized poor relief, Joel Harrington, "Escape from the Great Confinement," *Journal of Modern History* 71 (1999), 308–45; on the pre-Reformation development of a Weberian asceticism, Lutz Kaelber, "Other- and Inner-Worldly Asceticism in Medieval Waldensianism," *Sociology of Religion* 56 (1995), 95–119; the general position is formulated in the introduction to Heinz Schilling, *Die neue Zeit* (Berlin, 1999).

Nietzsche to reject the search for origins.[38] Second, given the difficulty of identifying confessional *propria* in the social realm, studies on them up until now have dealt primarily with theology, culture, or piety.[39] Finally, theology research has relativized the importance of the "new" aspects of Lutheranism even in areas where it might be assumed to be most evident. As historical theologians recast the early Reformation as a plausible outcome of late medieval theology rather than a revolt against it, as in the work of Heiko A. Oberman and Berndt Hamm, the idea of a "unique" Lutheran Reformation has been pushed into the background.[40] This stance has also had its effect on notions of a "revolutionary" Reformation; scholars assembled for a 1996 conference of the Verein für Reformationsgeschichte were evenly divided.[41] Willingness to minimize the role of theology in writing Reformation history has led to declarations among historians hailing the advent of a "post-confessional" Reformation history,[42] a turn which, if followed, is likely to push current social-cultural historians even further away from their counterparts in historical theology.

Having established reservations about the usefulness of the term "Lutheran," we turn now to conclusions drawn about it in post-mid-19th-century Reformation historiography. Pre-World War II thinkers and scholars tended to see the Lutheran Reformation as a decisive turning point and devoted no little effort to defining and explaining its social meaning. In a widely-read essay, Thomas A. Brady, Jr. termed these views "interpretive" or "teleological," the next section of the essay discusses some of them.[43] Brady notes that later "analytical" or "descriptive" scholarship, emerging mostly since the 1960s, based more on local, empirically-oriented research, questioned the conclusions

---

[38] *Nietzsche, Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe*, eds. Giorgio Colli et al. (Berlin, 1967–2006), Abt. 6, Bd. 2, *Jenseits von Gut und Böse. zur Genealogie der Moral (1886–1887)*; Michel Foucault, "Nietzsche, la généalogie, l'histoire," in idem, *Dits et Ecrits*, vol. II (Paris, 1971).

[39] E.g., Bodo Nischan, *Lutherans and Calvinists in the Age of Confessionalism* (Aldershot, 1999), Thomas Kaufmann, *Konfession und Kultur* (Tübingen, 2006), Matthias Pohlig, *Zwischen Gelehrsamkeit und konfessioneller Identitätsstiftung* (Tübingen, 2007).

[40] Heiko A. Oberman, *The Harvest of Medieval Theology* (Cambridge, MA, 1966) and idem, *The Dawn of the Reformation* (Edinburgh, 1986); Berndt Hamm, *The Reformation of Faith in the Context of Late Medieval Theology and Piety* (Leiden, 2004).

[41] *Die frühe Reformation in Deutschland als Umbruch*, eds. Bernd Moeller et al. (Gütersloh, 1998).

[42] Susan C. Karant-Nunn and Anne Jacobson Schutte, eds., "Focal Point/Themenschwerpunkt: Post-Confessional Reformation History," *ARG* 97 (2006), 276–306.

[43] Thomas A. Brady, Jr., "Social History," in *Reformation Europe: A Guide to Research*, ed. Steven Ozment (St Louis, 1982), pp. 161–81.

and even questions of the "teleological" work, concentrating instead on tangible material and phenomenological matters. This literature is treated in the subsequent section.

The History and Historiography of the Problem

The extent to which Luther and Lutheranism more generally created or sought to create a general political or social transformation in their immediate environments has been debated practically since the beginning of the Reformation itself. Because of close ties in the late Middle Ages and early modernity between church, state, and society, any development in one area inevitably influenced the others. Thus, concrete matters treated in Reformation theology about the nature of the church and its teachings, such as the definition of freedom, men's and women's callings and their relationship to governmental authority, monastic vows and clerical marriage, the status of images, and proper care for one's neighbor, among others, suggested important consequences in the minds of contemporaries for matters such as ongoing peasant challenges to remnants of feudal arrangements, the legitimacy and value of cloistered life and celibacy among the clergy, veneration of images and the donation of altarpieces, poor relief, and the church's status as property holder and tax collector. From the position of the historical theologian, it may be possible to assert that on an ideal level Luther or Lutheran theology did not seek fundamental social change. Still, the actions of 16th-century contemporaries in response to the ideas with which they came into contact force us to ask whether and how these possibilities became actions. Clearly—whether appropriately or not—some contemporaries did grasp and attempt to exploit the socially transformative potential of Reformation theology and if so, how? As the emergence of *Damenstifte* remind us, however, many obstacles stood in the path of the ideals of Reformation theology. While decisions to embrace Reformation teaching by legal corporations such as territorial states, cities, and cloisters could have significant outcomes in terms of distribution of charity, re-appropriation of ecclesiastical property, or willingness of Protestant entities to cooperate with decisions of imperial courts, theologians and their audiences were compelled to act for, against, within, and through contemporary administrative and legal structures, with their own histories, interests, and trajectories.

Our ability to evaluate such matters is not only complicated by our differing experience of the relationship of religion and politics than that of early modernity, but also inhibited by a great deal of leftover discursive debris. During the early Reformation vehement pamphlet polemics surrounded these matters, with critics charging that evangelicals and their supporters were willful authors of uproar and outrage, rebels who wanted to turn the world upside down and alter traditional relationships permanently—and, because allegations of novelty were generally a criticism in the early modern public sphere—for the worse. These themes were taken up wholeheartedly in the 19th century, an interlude of revolutionary fervor in most of continental Europe, during which historical perceptions of revolution were of great interest. Because the German state that emerged in 1871 was politically dominated by Protestants, notions of Lutheran revolution were encoded in the cultural rhetoric that supported the German national project. The image that most frequently comes to mind in connection with this mood is that of the *Thesenanschlag*: the frequently visualized moment when Luther struck a first blow for the liberty that the 19th century almost inevitably conceived in political and social terms.

Yet the image of the *Thesenanschlag* resonated primarily with the 19th century; though recent evidence suggests that while the story—the authenticity of which was questioned effectively enough in the mid-20th century that some are no longer convinced it happened[44]—was known in Wittenberg during Luther's lifetime, it was not initially a central moment of the developing Lutheran consciousness of the Reformation. The posting of the theses was a moment of intellectual or spiritual liberation.[45] Despite the sense of personal freedom Luther attained, however, he was not a social revolutionary; though the inherent connections between church and society were apparent to contemporaries, altering society by changing its religion was far from Luther's mind. With a few notable exceptions such as married clergy and lay education Luther sustained conservative positions on almost

[44] Erwin Iserloh, *Luther zwischen Reform und Reformation: Der Thesenanschlag fand nicht statt*, 3rd ed. (Münster, 1968), which includes a final chapter summarizing and responding to the debate at that stage. On recent source discoveries and their reception, Heike Schmoll, "Die Geschichte mit dem Aushang," in *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 14 February 2007, and subsequent letters to the editor.

[45] Volker Leppin, *Martin Luther* (Darmstadt, 2006), pp. 124–26.

every significant social issue of his time, and his Wittenberg successors were at pains to maintain this position, even exposing themselves to charges of currying favor from other movement centers, like Magdeburg. Theologians whose ideas carried the seeds of wide-ranging social reforms, like Andreas Karlstadt, were expelled from Wittenberg; groups whose ideas or practices challenged the early-16th-century social consensus were marginalized, persecuted, and threatened, not only by Catholic authorities, but eventually by Protestants as well.[46] Thus, notions of the Reformation's revolutionary potential conflict with the stance of actual Lutheranism; it proved hostile to revolutionary political change, seeking conciliation within the Holy Roman Empire repeatedly over decades, feared being characterized as "enthusiastic" in religion or innovative in social matters, even when it was introducing novelty—and eager to justify novelty as the restoration of earlier circumstances.[47] Most Lutheran communities did not become sudden centers of rapid social change; the reputation for social conservatism enjoyed by the so-called period of "Lutheran Orthodoxy" is largely deserved. Even if some pastors and theologians challenged the political stance of territorial rulers more than most twentieth-century scholarship admitted, they did not challenge the fundamental social order of the period.

This attitude toward social change has been subjected to many critical scholarly readings. The greatest minds of the 19th and 20th centuries debated these issues and drew the Reformation's social consequences to the center of scholarly discussion in history, sociology, politics, and economics for more than a century. A few remarks about them may suffice to show how these debates set questions that inspired later generations of Reformation historians.

Friedrich Engels, for example, interpreted the Reformation in light of the class struggles that Karl Marx saw as paving the path between feudal and capitalist society. Engels wrote *Der deutschen Bauernkrieg* (1850) to demonstrate how class interests during the German revolutions of 1848/1849 both caused their failure and were prefigured in

[46] David Mayes, "Heretics or Nonconformists? State Policies toward Anabaptists in 16th-Century Hesse," *SCJ* 32 (2001), 1003–1026; Sigrun Haude, *In the Shadow of "Savage Wolves"* (Boston, 2000).

[47] John M. Headley, "The Reformation as a Crisis in the Understanding of Tradition," *ARG* 78 (1987), 11–12; Bruce Gordon, "The Changing Face of Protestant History and Identity in the Sixteenthth Century," in *Protestant History and Identity in Sixteenth-Century Europe*, ed. Bruce Gordon, vol. 2, *The Later Reformation* (Aldershot, 1996), pp. 1–22.

the Peasants' War of 1525–6.[48] Here Lutheranism's conservatism lay in its allegiance to feudal social structure. Engels divided the political realm in the Reformation between a (Catholic) reactionary-conservative sphere, a (Lutheran) bourgeois-reforming sphere and a (Radical) revolutionary sphere led by Thomas Müntzer and followed by peasants who marched to their bloody defeat at Mühlhausen with pitchforks, the *Bundschuh* flag, and apocalyptic rhetoric ringing in their ears. The fate of the peasants was decided when Luther (like 19th-century bourgeois liberals who unleashed the revolution with their ideas and then betrayed it in their own public sphere) drew back from his prescriptions, maneuvered his sympathizers into the conservative camp, compromised his own theology, and finally unleashed a storm of invective to justify it all.[49] The work was a central educational tool for labor movements and influential on socialists like August Bebel, Karl Kautsky, and Franz Mehring.[50] It spawned the German Democratic Republic's reading of the Reformation, formulated most compactly by Max Steinmetz, who described the Peasants' War as one stage in an "early bourgeois revolution" (*frühbürgerliche Revolution*).[51] While western Marxist scholars of peasant studies also debated class structure and economic hierarchies, the East German vision's doctrinaire qualities provoked dissent in the West; the East Germans neglected the econometric analyses that would have substantiated their assertions.[52] The thesis of a social, class-based early modern revolution was weakened in favor of an ideological revolution,[53] even before the East German state faded away. East German scholarship on the Reformation is now studied as an artifact of the GDR and no longer retains centrality in ongoing research.[54]

Instead, the work that has emerged around the differing perspectives of Peter Blickle and Tom Scott, originally formulated in engagement

---

[48] A.G. Dickens and John Tonkin, *The Reformation in Historical Thought* (Oxford, 1985), pp. 238–39.

[49] Karl Marx/Friedrich Engels, *Gesamtausgabe*, Abt. 1, Bd. 10 (Berlin, 1977), pp. 367–443 and 962–83.

[50] Hartmut Lehmann, "Das marxistische Lutherbild vom Engels bis Honecker," in *Luther zwischen den Kulturen*, ed. Hans Medick and Peer Schmidt (Göttingen, 2004), pp. 500–14.

[51] Beginning with Max Steinmetz, "Die frühbürgerliche Revolution in Deutschland (1476 bis 1535)," *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft* 8 (1960), 114–24.

[52] Tom Scott, "The German Peasants' War and the 'Crisis of Feudalism'," *Journal of Early Modern History* 6 (2002), 265–96, pp. 268–69.

[53] Brady, "Social History," pp. 172–73.

[54] Laurenz Müller, *Diktatur und Revolution* (Bern, 2004), pp. 167–330.

with this debate, has become standard. Blickle maintained the notion of a "revolution," focusing on biblicist notions of freedom espoused by peasants to justify their challenge to the prevailing social order.[55] In his view a fundamental unity of interests united peasants and burghers and led to a shared "communal Reformation" that reflected (pre-confessional) evangelical religion.[56] Scott's view of the Peasants' War differed from both Blickle and the East Germans, setting aside both Blickle's emphasis on religion as a cause and a town-rural alliance[57] and the East Germans' schematic view of class transformation, promulgating instead a town-country conflict arising from contemporary economic and social transformation that led to specific alliances rooted in local contexts.[58] A recent heir to this tradition is David Mayes, who discusses the persistence of communal notions of religion which, he asserts, were used to stabilize rather than remake hierarchies within and around local communities.[59] Insofar as the Peasants' War foretells modernity, it is seen to do so in relationship to the emergence of human rights, where it represents a struggling step on the path toward peasant emancipation.[60]

The appeal of Marxism lay as much in its utopian vision of a different future as in its diagnoses of the social ills of emergent capitalism and industrialism; it seems to have disappeared along with the communist bloc. Perhaps Max Weber's work on Protestantism and capitalism fascinates due to the ongoing role capitalism plays in our lives, despite Weber's famously pessimistic attitude. In *Die Protestantische Ethik und der Geist des Kapitalismus* Weber located in the Reformation the roots of what he called the "spirit" of capitalism, an emerging worldview that legitimated the pursuit of wealth and the embrace of economic rationalism as linked to ever more intense human industry.[61] However, he judged

---

[55] Peter Blickle, *Die Revolution von 1525* (Munich, 1975), now in its fourth revised edition (2004), which includes a critical review of the most recent related literature.

[56] Peter Blickle, *Gemeindereformation* (Munich, 1985).

[57] Thomas A. Brady, Jr., "German Burghers and Peasants in Reformation and Peasants' War: Partners or Competitors?" in *Between the Middle Ages and Modernity*, ed. Michael W. Maher and Charles H. Parker (Lanham, 2007), pp. 33–51.

[58] Tom Scott, *Town, Country and Regions in Reformation Germany* (Leiden, 2005); *Freiburg and the Breisgau* (Oxford, 1986).

[59] David Mayes, *Communal Christianity* (Leiden, 2004).

[60] Peter Blickle, *Von der Leibeigenschaft zu den Menschenrechten* (Munich, 2003); *Kollektive Freiheitsvorstellungen im frühneuzeitlichen Europa (1400–1850)*, ed. Georg Schmidt (Frankfurt/M, 2003).

[61] Inter alia, Richard Swedberg, *Max Weber and the Idea of Economic Sociology* (Princeton, 1998), pp. 108–45; *The Cambridge Companion to Weber*, ed. (Cambridge, 2000); Gordon Marshall, *In Search of the Spirit of Capitalism* (New York, 1982); *Weber's Protestant Ethic*,

Lutheran teaching on "vocation" insufficient to develop a full-blown capitalist "spirit,"[62] preferring to root that step in (especially 17th-century) Calvinism, because Luther's teaching stressed that one's calling was not to be altered by humans but fulfilled in obedience to divine command. Much of the original context of Weber's writing, including its relationship to other discussions of the same theme, [63] and debates over Marxism and discussions of other religions' (especially Judaism's) connection to capitalism[64] has been forgotten. Lutheran history was not one of the primary areas in which ongoing discussions of the thesis were conducted, especially in the 20th century, although a number of scholars treated Calvinist aspects of it. Theologians charged that Weber misunderstood theology, especially the psychological significance of predestination. In historical work, Richard Gawthrop has argued that Weber mischaracterized Lutheran Pietist theology in relation to the thesis,[65] and apparently Luther's hostility to interest-charging also has been misunderstood.[66]

Attempts at testing the thesis have concentrated on its application to Calvinism,[67] although sociologists emphasize that the thesis, as a reflection of ideal type sociology, is not vulnerable to empirical critiques.[68] Grounded historical research on specifically Lutheran institutions has tended to find relatively few differences from their Calvinist counterparts; Thomas Safley, for instance, argues that the Protestant ethic was present in both Lutheran and Calvinist orphanages, due to cost considerations;[69] Volker Lenhart establishes an ascetic mood like that attributed to Calvinism in 17th-century pietist Lutheran pedagogical

---

eds. Hartmut Lehmann and Guenther Roth (Cambridge, 1993); Hartmut Lehmann, *Max Weber's "Protestantische Ethik"* (Göttingen, 1996).

[62] David-Emmanuel Mendes Sargo, "Martin Luther, Thomas Müntzer and the Birth of the Modern State," *Social Compass* 36 (1989), 105–31.

[63] Paul Münch, "The Thesis before Weber," in *Weber's Protestant Ethic*, pp. 51–81.

[64] Friedemann Voigt, "Vorbilder und Gegenbilder," in *Asketischer Protestantismus und der „Geist" des modernen Kapitalismus*, ed. Wolfgang Schluchter and Friedrich Wilhelm Graf (Tübingen, 2005), pp. 155–84.

[65] Richard L. Gawthrop, "Lutheran Pietism and the Weber Thesis," *German Studies Review* 12 (1989), 237–47.

[66] Eric Kerridge, *Usury, Interest and the Reformation* (Aldershot, 2002), pp. 23–52.

[67] Gordon Marshall, *Presbyteries and Profits* (Oxford, 1980); Jelle C. Riemersma, *Religious Factors in Early Dutch Capitalism* (The Hague, 1968).

[68] Fritz Ringer, *Max Weber's Methodology* (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 163–67; Arnd Hoffmann, *Zufall und Kontingenz in der Geschichtstheorie* (Frankfurt/M, 2005), pp. 121–28.

[69] Thomas Max Safley, *Charity and Economy in the Orphanages of Early Modern Augsburg* (Boston, 1997), 285–87.

texts, suggesting that the end result of Lutheran pietist pedagogy is a welfare state on the Prussian model.[70] Anthony La Vopa shows that Pietism's understanding of vocation lent itself to a selective upward mobility not apparent in Weber's readings[71] although Sheilagh Ogilvie (who did not test the thesis specifically) agrees that Lutheran education, which prioritized catechesis over higher skills, retarded capitalist development in southern Germany.[72]

Intimately connected with Weber's discussion of Lutheranism's relationship to modernity, and similarly influential were the works of Ernst Troeltsch. Troeltsch inherited a generation of scholarship on the Reformation in the wake of the 1883 Luther anniversary that considered Luther a progenitor of modernity, who opened the door to the modern family, state, and society.[73] In response to the reception of these ideas in contemporary theological and sociological scholarship,[74] in his *Die Soziallehren der christlichen Kirchen und Gruppen* (1912) and *Die Bedeutung des Protestantismus für die Entstehung der modernen Welt* (1928), Troeltsch asserted the conservative, indeed reactionary, character of Lutheran social conceptions, suggesting that while Lutheran churches were a remnant of feudal society, Calvinism and the revolutionary sects heralded modernity with individualism, tolerance, and (secular) democracy. While Troeltsch thus recognized connections between Protestantism and the development of individualism, at the same time, he interpreted features he associated with the German state and society (absolutism, obedience to authority, patriarchalism, exaggerated respect for social hierarchies, and so on) as legacies of Lutheranism. Although notable cultural figures, like Thomas Mann, agreed with Troeltsch, his position was highly controversial; theologian Werner Elert, for example, emphasized the seeds of modernity in his work on the legacy of Lutheranism, especially in the

---

[70] Volker Lenhart, *Protestantische Pädagogik und der "Geist" des Kapitalismus* (Frankfurt/M, 1998).

[71] Anthony J. LaVopa, "Vocations, Careers, and Talent: Lutheran Pietism and Sponsored Mobility in 18th-Century Germany," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 28 (1986), 255–86.

[72] Sheilagh Ogilvie, *A Bitter Living* (Oxford, 2006).

[73] Hartmut Lehmann, "Das Lutherjübiläum 1883," in idem, *Protestantische Weltsichten* (Göttingen, 1998), pp. 105–29.

[74] Luise Schorn-Schütte, "Altprotestantismus und moderne Welt. Ernst Troeltschs 'liberale' Deutungsmuster der nachreformatorischen Geschichte," in *Alte Europa oder frühe Moderne?*, ed. Luise Schorn-Schütte (Berlin, 1999), pp. 45–54; Mark D. Chapman, *Ernst Troeltsch and Liberal Theology* (Oxford, 2001).

social realm.[75] Troeltsch's ideas were also contested from the German idealist and nationalist perspective, for example, by Wilhelm Dilthey, who viewed the Reformation as a peculiarly German expression of notions of freedom operating during the Renaissance.

Discussions around Troeltsch's critiques of Lutheranism initiated 20th-century debates on the meaning of Lutheran social and political teachings. The political aspects revolved around the question of the potential in Lutheran theology to sustain a notion of political resistance and are treated elsewhere in this volume. The social aspects of the discussion concerned the emergence of social groups specifically pledged to uphold these ideals. Critiques like Troeltsch's suggested even before World War II that the position of the Lutheran clergy as a category of civil servant hampered democratic development because it removed the potential for resistance that would have been available to an independent clergy. Elert's later position on the so-called *Arierparagraph* of the 1933 law that forced "non-Aryans" out of the German civil service (Elert and colleague Paul Althaus concluded that Christians of Jewish background should be eliminated from significant church offices and not installed in new ones but not expelled from the church) has been read as a consequence of such tendencies.[76]

The discussion of the clergy's social role took a complex turn after World War II, when the German defeat discredited the nationalist interpretation of the Reformation. One extreme form of the discussion in the immediate postwar, termed the "Luther to Hitler thesis," made Lutheranism a root cause of the catastrophe. While it has never enjoyed currency among Reformation historians, who criticize its anachronistic qualities and faulty causal connections, it reappears occasionally and controversially in Holocaust research.[77] There, the thesis often takes up assertions about the roots of modern political antisemitism in Luther's

---

[75] Werner Elert, *Die Morphologie des Luthertums*. Bd. 2: *Soziallehren und Sozialwirkungen des Luthertums* (Munich, 1932); Thomas Kaufmann, "Gegenwartsdeutung und Geschichtsrekonstruktion im kirchenhistorischen Werk Werner Elerts," in *Alte Europa*, pp. 55–86.

[76] Thomas Kaufmann, "Werner Elert als Kirchenhistoriker," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 93 (1996), 193–242; Berndt Hamm, "Werner Elert als Kriegstheologe," *Kirchliche Zeitgeschichte* 11 (1998), 206–54.

[77] Daniel Jonah Goldhagen, *Hitler's Willing Executioners* (New York, 1996).

anti-Jewish writings, an area of fairly active scholarly discussion among Reformationists of which many modern historians seem unaware.[78]

Ideas about the social role of the Lutheran clergy also fed into the postwar discussion of the so-called *Sonderweg* or "special path" of German history, the idea that Germany's way into modernity differed infelicitously from that of the western European nation-states (and thus explained the resort to fascism).[79] An aspect of this paradigm was the supposed weakness of the German middle classes and the power of an effective bureaucracy in sustaining state authority. Clergy and theologians were guilty on two regards here, first as founding members of the peculiarly German *Bildungsbürgertum* (educated middle class) and second in their dependent relationship to the state, which their convictions allegedly prevented them from questioning. On this view, Lutheran pastors preached authoritarian doctrine to subdue unruly congregations,[80] and segments of the most anti-progressive elements of the German social elite also justified their social authority with Lutheranism.[81] Although the *Sonderweg* has been abandoned, some aspects of it are still in play, and claims about the bureaucracy have proved sturdy.[82] This debate is likely to be re-animated as modern historians rediscover confession as a significant category in 19th-century nationalism,[83] but new scholarship

---

[78] Heiko A. Oberman in *Die Wurzeln des Antisemitismus* (Berlin, 1981); *Jews, Judaism*, pp. 33–248; Thomas Kaufmann, *Konfession und Kultur*, pp. 112–54; Susan R. Boettcher, "Preliminary Considerations on the Rhetorical Construction of Jews in Lutheran Preaching at Mid-16th Century," in *Bundeseinheit und Gottesvolk* ed. Achim Detmers (Wuppertal, 2005), pp. 105–36; Thomas Kaufmann, *Luthers "Judenschriften" in ihren historischen Kontexten* (Göttingen, 2005).

[79] A concise overview of this historiographical strand and its fate is found in Jürgen Kocka, "Asymmetrical Historical Comparison: The Case of the German Sonderweg," *History and Theory* 38 (1999), 40–51. Its most well-known ongoing exponent is Hans-Ulrich Wehler, e.g., in *Deutsche Gesellschaftsgeschichte*, 4 vols. (Munich, 1987–2003).

[80] Ibid., 1:268–272.

[81] Hans Rosenberg, *Bureaucracy, Aristocracy, and Autocracy* (Cambridge, MA, 1958). That this strategy was effective is refuted in William Hagen, *Ordinary Prussians* (Cambridge, 2002); that the *Junker* were unusually conservative is contested in Patrick Wagner, *Bauern, Junker und Beamte* (Göttingen, 2005), but on conservative attitudes among pastors, see Oliver Janz, *Bürger besonderer Art* (Berlin, 1994). Gangolf Hübinger argues that a significant split in attitude separated rural Lutheran clergy from their urban and university counterparts into essentially two confessions in *Kulturprotestantismus und Politik* (Tübingen, 1994), but the actual relationship of these groups varied by territorial church and according to the relevant percentage of Lutherans in the territory.

[82] The most authoritative refutation of the *Sonderweg* was David Blackbourn and Geoff Eley, *The Peculiarities of German History* (Oxford, 1984), but see Kocka, "Historical Comparison," pp. 45–46.

[83] Key discussions include Olaf Blaschke, "Das 19. Jahrhundert. Ein zweites konfessionelles Zeitalter?" *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 26 (2000), 38–75; Anthony J. Steinhoff,

recognizes that 19th-century confessional sentiment was not derived directly from 16th-century confessional tensions. Awareness of the complex trajectory between the Reformation and modern religion is also aided by the last decade of strong Pietism research[84] and increased interest in Lutheranism as a factor in the German Enlightenment.[85]

Among Reformation scholars, the basic question of this complex of issues—did Lutherans and Lutheran pastors espouse attitudes that eventually permitted or generated an unreasonably conservative, reactionary, or fascist social ideology?—provided *explananda* for Luise Schorn-Schütte's pioneering study of early modern clergy in Braunschweig, Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel, and Hesse-Kassel.[86] Schorn-Schütte emphasizes the clergy as mediators between state and society and their use of their role to challenge authorities, particularly their increasingly secular social politics. Earlier work on 19th-century intellectual and scholarly history puts Schorn-Schütte in an almost unique position in the German historical profession to comment on both modern historical-sociological theory and early modern social history.[87] Still, most of the debate over the Lutheran relationship to authoritarian or anti-democratic thinking takes place in literature on the relationship of politics, theology and the state,[88] and so other current studies of the

---

"Ein zweites konfessionelles Zeitalter?," *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 30 (2004), 59–70; idem, "Christianity and the Creation of Germany," in *Cambridge History of Christianity* vol. 9, *World Christianities c. 1815–1914*, ed. Sheridan Gilley (Cambridge, 2005). See also George Williamson, "A Religious Sonderweg?," *CH* 75 (2006), 139–56.

[84] Especially *Geschichte des Pietismus*, eds. Martin Brecht et al., 4 vols. (Göttingen, 1993–2004).

[85] E.g., Jonathan Sheehan, *The Enlightenment Bible* (Princeton, 2006).

[86] Luise Schorn-Schütte, *Evangelische Geistlichkeit in der Frühneuzeit* (Gütersloh, 1996), pp. 455–56.

[87] Luise Schorn-Schütte, *Karl Lamprecht* (Göttingen, 1984) and many other essays, especially "E. Troeltschs 'Soziallehren' und die gegenwärtige Frühneuzeitforschung," in *E. Troeltschs Soziallehren*, ed. Friedrich Wilhelm Graf and Trutz Rendtorff (Gütersloh, 1993), pp. 133–51.

[88] Inter alia, *Das Widerstandsrecht als Problem der deutschen Protestanten 1523–1546*, ed. Heinz Scheible (Gütersloh, 1969); Eike Wolgast, *Die Wittenberger Theologie und die Politik der evangelischen Stände* (Heidelberg, 1977); Luise Schorn-Schütte, "Die Drei-Stände-Lehre im reformatorischen Umbruch," in *Frühe Reformation*, pp. 435–461; Robert von Friedeburg, *Widerstandsrecht und Konfessionskonflikt* (Berlin, 1999); idem, "Welche Wegscheide in die Neuzeit? Protestantisches Widerstandsrecht, 'Gemeiner Mann' und konfessioneller Landespatriotismus zwischen 'Münster' und 'Magdeburg,'" *HZ* 270 (2000), 561–616; David M. Whitford, *Tyranny and Resistance* (St Louis, 2001); David M. Whitford, "From Speyer to Magdeburg: The Development and Maturation of a Hybrid Theory of Resistance to Tyranny," *ARG* 96 (2005), 57–80. Studies of specific cases are included in Thomas Kaufmann, *Das Ende der Reformation* (Tübingen, 2003), and in Luise Schorn-Schütte, ed., *Das Interim 1548–1550* (Gütersloh, 2005).

social circumstances and role of the Lutheran clergy are inspired by other questions, discussed below.

All of these discussions—revolution, capitalism, religious social values, politics—point to their participants' efforts to elucidate a relationship between Lutheranism and modernity. Weber and Troeltsch in particular also associated the Reformation with the emergence of the European individual, picking up on themes in the work of Jakob Burckhardt on the Renaissance.[89] In the mid-20th century psychologist Erik Erikson drew upon his own eight-stage, Freudian-inspired development theory in *Young Man Luther* (1958) to propose that Luther's struggle to free himself from the church constituted the initial modern "identity crisis".[90] Although Erikson's ideas became widely known among developmental psychologists and educators, they mostly provoked scoffing among Reformation historians.[91] Recent social theorists like Charles Taylor have rooted the "birth of the individual" in a later period.[92] Although Taylor disavowed a developmental account of the emergence of the modern self, his work directly inspired the flourishing field of research on individual life-writing of early modernity.[93] Individual statements had always played a significant role in certain strands of history writing (the micro-histories of Steven Ozment, many of which deal with the Lutherans of Nuremberg, rely heavily on such texts),[94] which often took up the more striking texts by landmark or prominent persons. Newer research has excavated dozens of more typical texts by more "typical" authors and focuses instead on the social location of life-writing and its generic features and conventions.[95]

---

[89] Jakob Burckhardt, *Die Kultur der Renaissance in Italien. Ein Versuch*, Bd. 5 in *Gesamtausgabe Jakob Burckhardt*, ed. Werner Kaegi (Stuttgart, 1929–1930).

[90] Erik H. Erikson, *Young Man Luther* (New York, 1958); idem, *Childhood and Society* (New York, 1950).

[91] *Psychohistory and Religion*, ed. Roger A. Johnson (Philadelphia, 1977).

[92] Charles Taylor, *Sources of the Self* (Cambridge, MA, 1989); but see David Warren Sabean, "Production of the Self during the Age of Confessionalization," *Central European History* 29 (1997), 1–18.

[93] German scholarship on this material also drew on Georg Misch's literature-oriented studies of autobiography: *Geschichte der Autobiographie*, 4 vols. (Frankfurt/M, 1950–1969); see also Jaana Eichhorn, *Geschichtswissenschaft zwischen Tradition und Innovation* (Göttingen, 2006), pp. 213–30.

[94] Steven Ozment, *Flesh and Spirit* (New York, 2001).

[95] *Von der dargestellten Person zum erinnerten Ich*, ed. Kaspar von Greyerz et al. (Cologne, 2001), pp. 3–31; Gabriele Jancke, *Autobiographie als soziale Praxis* (Cologne, 2002), pp. 1–31; Thomas Max Safley, *Mattheus Miller's Memoir* (Basingstoke, 2000); Jan Peters, *Mit Pflug und Gänsekiel* (Cologne, 2003); Eva Kormann, *Ich, Welt und Gott* (Cologne, 2004); Lorenz Heiligensetzer, *Getreue Kirchendiener—gefährdete Pfarrherren* (Cologne, 2006).

This discussion suggests that most questions in Lutheran history stemming from the "teleological" literature have moved to fields of inquiry somewhat removed from their motivating discussions. One exception that demonstrates continued value in ongoing dialogue with "teleological" analyses is the debate over the sources of secularism in European modernity. The current and future role of religion in Europe was broached especially by Weber and Troeltsch, but was also treated by Marx, Sigmund Freud, Émile Durkheim, and Dilthey. The word has a long history among German thinkers,[96] and has been a constant source of debate among 20th-century sociologists.[97] The basis for this relationship varies: Weber, in the most famous formulation of the problem, mentioned the Reformation's role in the *Entzauberung* of the world; other authors have noted that the competition of multiple stances during confessionalization challenged the religious worldview and weakened ecclesiastical monopoly on social and cultural norms.[98] The latter position is contested; some sociologists of religion argue that religious sentiment actually intensifies when religious systems compete.[99] Research on secularism is fueled by recent signs of the unique quality of the western road to secularism and the increasingly tenuous appearance of some of its features (even in the West), as well as by reactions to the confessionalization thesis, itself related to debates about the role early modern religion played in modernization theory.[100] Confessionalization research's emphasis on the intensifying religious features of early modernity raised questions about the origins of the secularism emerging after mid-17th century:[101] tolerance initiatives,[102] features of

[96] Hartmut Lehmann, *Säkularisierung* (Göttingen, 2004), pp. 36–56.

[97] Philip S. Gorski, "Historicizing the Secularization Debate," *American Sociological Review* 65 (2000), 138–167.

[98] Sabine Ullmann, "Zwei Konfessionen in einer Gemeinde," in *Die Säkularisation im Prozess der Säkularisierung Europas*, ed. Peter Blickle and Rudolf Schlögl (Epfendorf, 2005), pp. 95–111, esp. p. 96, n. 6.

[99] Rodney Stark and Laurence Iaconne, "A Supply-Side Re-Interpretation of the 'Secularization' of Europe," *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 33 (1994), 230–252.

[100] Heinz Schilling, "Luther, Loyola, Calvin und die europäische Neuzeit," *ARG* 85 (1994), 5–31.

[101] Schindling, "Konfessionalisierung," pp. 16–17.

[102] *Union—Toleration—Konversion*, ed. Heinz Duchhardt (Mainz, 2000); Hans-Joachim Müller, *Irenik als Kommunikationsreform* (Göttingen, 2004); Harm Klueting, *Irenik und Antikonfessionalismus im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert* (Hildesheim, 2003); Christopher Spehr, *Aufklärung und Ökumene* (Tübingen, 2005).

the modern state,[103] and the resort to *raison d'état* politics.[104] A related research trend emphasizes the role that Protestantism played in the suppression of religious emotion.[105] Sociologist Philip S. Gorski reconciles the dualism of confessionalization and secularization by arguing that the rationalization of religion in the Reformation and the social de-differentiation of confessional society intensified religious authority.[106] No historical study has been developed to test this theory, of which most Reformationists seem unaware.

The "teleological" literature about the Reformation's social impact assumed a tremendous role for the content of belief in history at the same time it ruthlessly criticized those beliefs for their backward, conservative, reactionary, or insufficiently "modern" attitudes. They were related to debates common in 19th-century circles about the "character" and "meaning" of Protestant Christianity.[107] Historians have questioned and refuted these ideas, but they remain significant as "big questions" relevant to the meaning of modernity. In contrast, the last forty years of social history research was termed "analytical" or "descriptive" by Brady, though it sheds light on some of "teleological" questions.[108] This research attempts to describe the status of groups and their relationships with each other and their political, cultural, religious, or material environments. Reformation research was a relatively young field within the area of social history research generally and lagged behind its emergence in other fields in the Anglo-American and German academy. As late as 1976, for example, Robert Scribner questioned where the social history of the Reformation could be found,[109] but as Mack Holt

---

[103] Michael Stolleis, "'Konfessionalisierung' und 'Säkularisierung' bei der Entstehung des frühmodernischen Staates," *Ius Commune* 20 (1993), 1–23.

[104] Michael Stolleis, *Staat und Staatsräson in der frühen Neuzeit* (Frankfurt/M, 1990); Axel Gotthard, *Konfession und Staatsräson* (Stuttgart, 1992); Cornel Zwierlein, *Discorso und Lex Dei (*Göttingen, 2006); Heinz Schilling, *Konfessionalisierung und Staatsinteressen 1559–1600* (Paderborn, 2007).

[105] Rudolf Schlögel, "Rationalisierung als Entsinnlichung religiöser Praxis?" in *Die Säkularisation*, pp. 37–64; Susan C. Karant-Nunn, "'Gedanken, Herz und Sinn': Die Unterdrückung der religiösen Emotionen," in *Kulturelle Reformation*, ed. Bernhard Jussen und Craig Koslofsky (Göttingen, 1999), pp. 69–95.

[106] Gorski, "Historicizing the Secularization Debate".

[107] Friedrich Wilhelm Graf, *Der Protestantismus: Geschichte und Gegenwart* (Munich, 2006).

[108] Brady, "Social History," pp. 161–62.

[109] Bob Scribner, "Is There a Social History of the Reformation?" *Social History* 4 (1976), 483–505.

established in 2003, progress was made quickly.[110] Newer research has abandoned the assumption that doctrine and theology alone were powerful enough to determine the direction of social change, as well as the notion that Reformation theologies had essential social meanings; instead, on the view of this scholarship social transformations resulted from complex negotiations between tradition, theology, and material circumstance in particular local contexts.

Contemporary Conditions, the Reformation, and German Social Hierarchies in 16th and 17th-Century Central Europe

The social character of Lutheran society played against the background of the period's material circumstances, which the Reformation did not change and which may have played a role in its reception. Increased awareness of such circumstances is one reason why "teleological" work has faded into the background of Reformation research. The period was often termed an "iron century" or "age of crisis".[111] Its components included a frightening demographic regime in which a minority of live births survived to adulthood and a woman of forty was older than average; complex and hardening systems of land tenure; epidemic disease with little defensive remedy; near-absolute dependence on the agricultural regime; the period's unusually cold weather, or "Little Ice Age;" the "price revolution" or annual average inflation of 3%; minimal urbanization and abandoned settlements (some still visible in the German landscape); the Thirty Years' War with its drastic demographic and economic effects; and increasing poverty and homelessness. While it would be false to read theological matters as a direct response to economic circumstances, still this portrait illuminates our understanding of several social issues raised among Lutherans: Should midwives be allowed to baptize infants? Should children contract marriage

[110] Mack P. Holt, "The Social History of the Reformation," *Social History* 37 (2003), 133–44.

[111] Henry Kamen, *The Iron Century: Social Change in Europe, 1550–1660* (London, 1971); Theodore K. Rabb, *The Struggle for Stability in Early Modern Europe* (New York, 1975); Jan de Vries, *The Economy of Europe in an Age of Crisis* (Cambridge, 1976); *The General Crisis of the 17th Century*, eds. Geoffrey Parker and Lesley M. Smith (London, 1978). A useful survey with some reformulations is Sheilagh Ogilvie, "Germany and the 17th-Century Crisis," *Historical Journal* 35 (1992), 417–42. See Hartmut Lehmann, *Transformationen der Religion in der Neuzeit* (Göttingen, 2007), pp. 11–99.

independently of their parents' wishes? Should children go to school? Dare peasants resist their rulers? What are the obligations of the nobility? How should the poor be treated? Changes in ideological factors governing these arrangements held real potential to influence daily lives.

In terms of social organization, which to some extent responded to these matters, Lutheranism emerged into a society of orders in which rights, privileges, immunities, and applicable laws were determined by membership in a social group, order, or estate. Limited "social mobility" was possible on the borders of these groups; the hierarchy was seen as divinely ordained.[112] The estates—clergy, nobility, and urban commoners, represented by municipal delegates—were each represented in some way in the *Reichstag* or imperial diet. By the 16th century these groups were no longer tied exclusively to productive functions. In the Holy Roman Empire the complexity of the orders stemmed from a peculiar constitutional relationship between church and state, in which ecclesiastical princes helped elect the Holy Roman Emperor and controlled legally distinct ecclesiastical and temporal territories.

Each estate was divided by subgroups with different interests. The nobility experienced internal gradations between electors, princes, and dukes, counts and lords, and knights; its membership was divided between direct (*reichsunmittelbar*) subjects of the emperor—mostly in the west and Austria—and those subject to an intermediate noble or nobles, predominantly in the East.[113] Gradations determined not only the privileges of different groups but appropriate marital alliances. Most noble families resided in the country where they collected taxes; a few maintained urban residences or courts, or purchased citizenship in a town. The 16th century witnessed a rise in their educational level as legal knowledge became increasingly important to estate administration. Much has been made of the difficulties of one segment, the free imperial knights, a group without representation in the diet, in maintaining its social and political status, because some members (Ulrich von Hutten, Götz von Berlichingen, Franz von Sickingen, Wilhelm von Grumbach) were notorious rebels.[114] Less discussion has been devoted to

---

[112] Winfried Schulze, ed., *Ständegesellschaft und soziale Mobilität* (Munich, 1988).

[113] Horst Rabe, *Reich und Glaubensspaltung* (Munich, 1989), pp. 76–102.

[114] Hillay Zmora, *State and Nobility in Early Modern Germany* (Cambridge, 1997); Volker Press, *Adel im alten Reich* (Tübingen, 1998); Helmut Neumaier, "*Daß wir kein anderes Haupt oder von Gott eingesetzte zeitliche Obrigkeit haben*" (Stuttgart, 2005); William D. Godsey, Jr., *Nobles and National in Central Europe* (Cambridge, 2004).

the struggles of territorial sovereigns to enforce their will upon middling and lower nobilities also attempting to rationalize the administration of their privileges.[115]

While the Reformation provided a lever for the princes against the emperor, the political significance of this development must be located in a longer-term trajectory.[116] Ongoing princely support for territorial reformations was motivated by medieval ideals about princely responsibility for religion, dynastic matters, and early modern state-building processes, much more than by a modern "will to power".[117] These motives, not limited to male rulers, were often intertwined.[118] Territorial rulers began to exercise increased control over religious practice and general behavior of noble, common, and ecclesiastical subjects. The novelty of this development has been debated. Older scholarship rooted the Peace of Augsburg's assignment of the *ius reformandi* to territorial sovereigns in the wake of late medieval papal attempts to stem conciliarism by granting particular rights to national churches, but current research stresses the novelty of the rulers' right to promulgate and enforce doctrine formulated by local theologians, specific to their territories.[119] (This theme is also discussed elsewhere in this volume.) Still, expanding social discipline was carried out by all authorities (ecclesiastical, urban, communal, territorial) in all confessions.

Church and social discipline were intertwined. Norms espoused in attempts to control daily behavior were of Christian origin, even if the content of confessional theology was not exhausted in their definitions, and punishments were executed in the religious community. Despite the

---

[115] *Hochadelige Herrschaft im mitteldeutschen Raum (1200–1600). Formen—Legitimation—Repräsentation*, eds. Jörg Rogge and Uwe Schirmer (Stuttgart, 2003).

[116] Wolfgang Reinhard, "Das Wachstum der Staatsgewalt," *Der Staat 31* (1992), 59–75; Ernst Schubert, *Fürstliche Herrschaft und Territorium im späten Mittelalter* (Munich, 1996), pp. 80–92.

[117] Manfred Rudersdorf, "Die Generation der lutherischen Landesväter im Reich," in *Territorien des Reichs*, 7:17–70, offers a useful breakdown with examples.

[118] Rudersdorf, pp. 163–167; For inseparability of motives of one figure Andreas Klinger, *Der Gothaer Fürstenstaat. Herrschaft, Konfession und Dynastie unter Herzog Ernst dem Frommen* (Husum, 2002) and Veronika Albrecht-Birkner, *Reformation des Lebens. Die Reformen Herzog Ernsts des Frommen von Sachsen-Gotha und ihre Auswirkungen auf Frömmigkeit, Schule und Alltag im ländlichen Raum (1640–1675)* (Leipzig, 2002); Mary Noll Venables, "In the Shadow of War: The Reign of Ernst the Pious in 17th-Century Saxony," (Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 2004).

[119] For the older position, see RGG[3] s.v. "Ius circa sacra;" for the new position, Bernd Christian Schneider, *Ius Reformandi* (Tübingen, 2001), but also Christopher W. Close, "The Mindelaltheim Affair: High Justice, Ius Reformandi, and the Rural Reformation in Eastern Swabia (1542–1546)," *SCJ* 38 (2007), 371–92.

confessionalization debate's role in spurring such research, Lutheran discipline has been studied less intensively than Calvinist efforts.[120] Doctrinal ambivalence in Lutheranism about the role of discipline (between a hesitant Luther, who emphasized the pastor's role, and Justus Jonas, who argued for a secular role) may have contributed to a less organized development of disciplining institutions than in Calvinist areas.[121] Early on, Lutheran territorial rulers seemed less than proactive in their attempts to establish their churches, leading to staffing shortages at mid-16th century; Electoral Saxony took almost twenty years to create a central ordination procedure.[122] Models of discipline emerged in Saxony and Württemberg. In Electoral Saxony, centralized church courts, or consistories, emerged in 1539 and were primarily occupied with marriage (later church property and clergy) cases.[123] These courts were courts of appeal dependent on other state institutions. By 1553 a model emerged in Württemberg that supervised not only morals but also the clergy and other administrative affairs; while secular officials were among its governors, it managed church affairs independently of the state.[124] The variety of such institutions in Lutheran territories was much broader, ranging from combinations of these models in Brandenburg-Ansbach-Kulmbach, to a congregational elder model in Nassau-Dillenberg, to pastoral control in Hohenlohe.[125] Visitations,

---

[120] On Calvinism, Ute Lotz-Heumann, "Imposing Church and Social Discipline," in *Christianity: Reform and Expansion, 1500–1660*, ed. R. Po-Chia Hsia (Cambridge, 2007), pp. 244–60, pp. 254–58.

[121] Lotz-Heumann, "Imposing Church and Social Discipline," pp. 251–52; Helga Schnabel-Schüle, "Der große Unterschied und seine kleinen Folgen," in *Krisenbewußtsein und Krisenbewaltigung in der frühen Neuzeit*, ed. Monika Hagemaier and Sabine Holtz (Frankfurt/M, 1992), pp. 197–214.

[122] Martin Krarup, *Ordination in Wittenberg* (Tübingen, 2007) although Krarup is suspicious of older literature that related development of the rite to a pressing need for pastors, see pp. 193–96.

[123] F. Scott Dixon, *The Reformation and Rural Society* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 54–55. Karl Müller, "Die Anfänge der Konsistorialverfassung im lutherischen Deutschland," *HZ* 3 (1909), 1–30; Irmgard Höss, "The Lutheran Church of the Reformation," in *The Social History of the Reformation*, ed. Lowell Buck and Jonathan Zophy (Columbus, 1972), pp. 317–39.

[124] Martin Brecht, *Kirchenordnung und Kirchenzucht in Württemberg vom 16. bis zum 18. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart, 1967); idem, "Protestantische Kirchenzucht zwischen Kirche und Staat," in *Kirchenzucht und Sozialdisziplinierung im frühneuzeitlichen Europa*, ed. Heinz Schilling (Berlin, 1994), pp. 41–48; Bruce Tolley, *Pastors and Parishioners in Württemberg during the Late Reformation, 1581–1621* (Stanford, 1995).

[125] Lotz-Heumann, "Imposing…Discipline," p. 252. Günther Franz, *Die Kirchenleitung in Hohenlohe in den Jahrzehnten nach der Reformation* (Stuttgart, 1971). See also Frank

however, can be considered a more quintessentially Lutheran institution of social discipline.[126] Research on the Saxon visitations is well-known because of response to the work of Gerald Strauss, but most Lutheran territories await more comprehensive studies of their visitations.[127]

Comparative research between confessions to allow firm conclusions about the results of Lutheran social discipline is limited. Sebastian Schmidt's recent book on discipline in everyday life in Siegen and Dillenburg reveals no significant difference in the exercise or outcomes of social disciplining between Lutheran and Calvinist areas.[128] Some authors conclude that popular calls for social disciplining were stronger in southern Germany and Calvinist areas, while Lutheran areas seem to have experienced a stronger top-down social disciplining, but this pattern may result from political rather than confessional factors. Evidence for a general acceptance of social discipline in the populace, while also limited, can be found in both Lutheran and Calvinist areas.[129] Researchers influenced by historical anthropology have turned from specifically confessional matters to focus on the policing of particular transgressions in local settings to excavate the issues at stake for both perpetrators and authorities in negotiating attitudes toward and disposal of penalties for specific kinds of immoral or illegal behavior; this literature is still too piecemeal in its coverage, however to permit general conclusions.[130]

Konersmann, *Kirchenregiment und Kirchenzucht in frühneuzeitlichen Kleinstaat* (Cologne, 1996); Dixon, *Reformation and Rural Society*, pp. 55–59.

[126] Lotz Heumann, "Imposing…Discipline," pp. 252–54. Siegfried Müller, "Die Konfessionalisierung in der Grafschaft Oldenburg," *ARG* 86 (1995), 257–319; Frank Konersmann, "Kirchenvisitation als landesherrliches Kontrollmittell und als Regulativ dörflicher Kommunikation," in *Kriminalitätsgeschichte*, ed. Andreas Blauert and Gerd Schwerhoff (Constance, 2000), pp. 603–25.

[127] Besides sources in n. 18 above, see Albrecht-Birkner, *Reformation des Lebens*, pp. 75–423; Terence McIntosh, "Public Church Penance in Saxony," in *Ways of Knowing*, ed. Mary Lindemann (Leiden, 2004), pp. 191–210; Dixon, *Reformation and Rural Society*, pp. 60–65; and James A. Goodale, "Rethinking the Rural Reformation," (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1995).

[128] Sebastian Schmidt, *Glaube—Herrschaft—Disziplin* (Paderborn, 2005); Rabe, *Reich und Glaubensspaltung*, p. 325.

[129] Ibid., p. 372; Ulrich Pfister, "Reformierte Sittenzucht zwischen kommunaler und territorialer Organisation. Graubunden, 16.–18. Jahrhundert," *ARG* 87 (1996), 287–333, p. 288; Anja Johann, *Kontrolle mit Konsens* (Frankfurt/M, 2001).

[130] B. Ann Tlusty, *Bacchus and Civic Order* (Charlottesville, 2001); Franziska Loetz, *Mit Gott handeln* (Göttingen, 2002); Gerd Schwerhoff, *Zungen wie Schwerter* (Constance, 2005).

Even if it caused responsibilities to change hands, however, the Reformation hardly invented either church or social discipline.[131] Church ordinances establishing new churches relied on features of previous ecclesiastical law but typically failed to mention it.[132] Thomas Safley provides a particularly concrete discussion of the transition between medieval marital courts in south Germany and their Reformation-era successors.[133] In the medieval church visitations had been organized by bishops and social discipline exercised through *Sendgerichte*, which persisted into the Tridentine era; after Trent they also became tools of political manipulation between different levels of the church hierarchy.[134] Higher-level internal Lutheran discussions and conflicts over visitations need more systematic treatment, as visitations have usually been used to study social disciplining and confessionalization. Moreover, changes in ecclesiastical administration were only one aspect of the territorial rulers' growth in power. They increased already-extant prerogatives to punish crime, created or expanded bureaucracies to administer churches, courts, schools, and universities; they also rationalized weights and measures, enforced and consolidated traditional privileges, managed access to natural resources, and organized the military. Financial and tax administration became increasingly complicated and time-consuming.[135] Uwe Schirmer has effectively detailed these developments for electoral Saxony, showing in particular that the increased financial demands from state administration and rationalization meant that rulers not only had to control their subjects but themselves (in their incurrence and management of public debt) as well.[136] Like church and social disciplining, these developments seem to have encountered little active resistance. In Württemberg, for example, territorial management of local woodlands was welcomed by locals.[137] Research on this sort of discipline and governmental development combines studies of social disciplining with increased attention to the sovereign administration of *Policey*.[138]

---

[131] Ute Lotz-Heumann, "Imposing…Discipline," pp. 244–45.

[132] Karla Sichelschmidt, *Recht aus christlicher Liebe oder obrigkeitlicher Gesetzesbefehl?* (Tübingen, 1995), pp. 183–87.

[133] Thomas Max Safley, *Let No Man Put Asunder* (Kirksville, 1984).

[134] Thomas Paul Becker, *Konfessionalisierung im Kürköln* (Bonn, 1989); *Visitation und Send im Archidiakonat Bonn*, ed. Thomas Becker et al. (Siegburg, 2000).

[135] Schilling, *Konfessionalisierung und Staatsinteressen*, 30–32.

[136] Uwe Schirmer, *Kursächsische Staatsfinanzen.*

[137] Paul Warde, *Economy, Ecology and State Formation* (Cambridge, 2006).

[138] See *Die Gute Policey im Reichskreis*, ed. Wolfgang Wüst (Berlin, 2001–2004), 3 vols.; Achim Landwehr, *Policey im Alltag* (Frankfurt/M, 2000); *Gute Policey als Politik im 16. Jahrhundert*, ed. Peter Blickle (Frankfurt/M, 2002).

As the need for administrators grew, the resulting shift in social arrangements led to re-organization of political and social prerogatives of different subordinate noble (and *bürgerliche*) groups, creating new groups with their own differentiated political or social interests, or "functional elites". This term, imported from sociology, refers to groups constituted through a particular social function (as opposed to being united by class considerations or personalistic loyalties). Uwe Schirmer has described how the lower nobility of Saxony (in the process of systematizing resource access, creating control organizations, and constituting a bureaucracy that relied on increasing literacy) took on such qualities, "exchanging its freedom for material dependency, even if the rewards remained small at first".[139] The lower nobility became courtly counselors and officials; other groups of administrators formed among university-educated officials (like the *Stadtschreiber*)[140] influenced by the ideals of Erasmian reform,[141] or among doctors of law, who promoted the era's transition from German common law to Roman civil law.[142] (University professors, pastors, and teachers were also entities in this sense.) These groups were not formed by statist impulses but rather developed out of interactions between different interested parties[143] and included small-time officials and bureaucrats.[144]

Most of the German nobility was less involved with territorial consolidation than with local administrative matters that tied them closely to their tenants. The distinction surveys make between systems of land administration (*Grundherrschaft* more common in the west, *Gutsherrschaft* characteristic of areas east of the Elbe) was gaining strength but bore little relationship to religious change. Nobles with *Grundherrschaft*, which allowed rights to be more easily divided, lost traction after the plagues because of population decline, which made it harder to hold peasants; noble attempts to recoup mid-15th-century losses may have been one trigger of the period's peasant unrest, which, however, preceded the Reformation. Beneficiaries of *Gutsherrschaft*, in comparison, had been able to tie independent peasants to their estates while increasing labor obligations, a process confusingly called "second serfdom". Conclusions

---

[139] Schirmer, *Staatsfinanzen*, p. 877.

[140] Peter Hoheisel, *Die Göttinger Stadtschreiber bis zur Reformation* (Göttingen, 1998); Manfried Schmidt, *Die Stadtschreiber von Nürnberg* (Nürnberg, 1979).

[141] Elisabeth Kloosterhuis, *Erasmusjünger als politischer Reformer* (Cologne, 2006).

[142] Gerald Strauss, *Law, Resistance, and the State* (Princeton, 1986), pp. 165–90.

[143] *Power Elites and Statebuilding*, ed. Wolfgang Reinhard (Oxford, 1996).

[144] An exemplary study of such groups from our period is Thomas Klingebiel, *Ein Stand für sich?* (Hanover, 2002).

about discipline in eastern Europe will need to account for strongly contrasting organization of social authority, often organized by individual landowners—and may mean rethinking the effect of social disciplining on rural populations in western Europe as well.[145] Eastern territories were mostly unaffected by peasant revolts, although the reasons why are uncertain.[146] Moreover, even in the west, revolts were less likely after 1525. Peasant willingness to acquiesce to the territorial state's increasing demands was rooted in the state's protection of their social status against local seigneurs; a Reformation ideology that emphasized the peasant head of household's significance; and erosion of traditional authority within communities.[147] Seigneurs traumatized by the war may have used the law to address their problems rather than provoking open revolts.[148] Studies with long-term frameworks suggest that while the territorial reformations put pressure on rural communes to conform religiously and behaviorally, their social impact, in comparison with other factors, was limited.[149] The Reformation enjoyed only a slow, limited impact on religious attitudes as traditional religious conceptions tended to persist rather than being quickly replaced by confessional identities.[150] The devoutly Lutheran rural populations of stereotypes are, at best, the result of at least a century of acculturation; modern histories of these communities concentrate much more heavily on household, marriage, and kinship than on the effects of religion. Claudia Ulbrich's recent work on rural Christian-Jewish interactions in a later period, however, points in interesting directions about rural religious relationships.[151]

Besides peasants, other significant segments among commoners were the social gradations of urban residents: citizens and inhabitants, patricians, artisans, servants, day laborers, and the indigent. The

---

[145] Sheilagh Ogilvie, "'So That Every Subject Knows How to Behave': Social Disciplining in Early Modern Bohemia," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 48 (2006): 38–78.

[146] Hagen, *Ordinary Prussians*, pp. 38–39.

[147] Thomas Robisheaux, "The Peasantries of Western Germany, 1300–1750," in *The Peasantries of Europe*, ed. Tom Scott (London, 1998), pp. 111–42, at pp. 138–39; idem, "Peasants and Pastors: Rural Youth Control and the Reformation in Hohenlohe, 1540–1680," *Social History* 6 (1981), 281–300; idem, *Rural Society*, pp. 66–67.

[148] Winfried Schulze, "Die veränderte Bedeutung sozialer Konflikte im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert," in *Der deutsche Bauernkrieg, 1524–1526*, ed. Hans-Ulrich Wehler (Göttingen, 1975), pp. 277–302.

[149] Robisheaux, *Rural Society*, p. 259; Dixon, *Reformation and Rural Society*, p. 205.

[150] Mayes, *Communal Christianity*, pp. 23–204; Hagen, *Ordinary Prussians*, p. 123.

[151] Claudia Ulbrich, *Shulamit und Margarethe* (Cologne, 1999).

urban reformations constituted the most significant field of postwar social historical inquiry; Bernd Moeller inspired much of this work. In *Reichsstadt und Reformation* (1962), Moeller argued that certain strains of the Reformation coincided with late medieval urban patrician self-awareness of the city as a sacral community.[152] Hans-Christoph Rublack supervised a productive group at Tübingen on this topic in the 1970s and 1980s. While the most vehement opposition to this argumentation came from Steven Ozment, for whom the Reformation stemmed from ecclesiastical abuses and an overwhelming penitential burden similar in cities and country,[153] the most long-lasting rejoinder to the "Moeller thesis" is found in Thomas Brady's work on Strasbourg, which discussed negotiations over introducing the Reformation as a political tool for urban social groups such as lesser guildsmen.[154] Nonetheless, Tübingen's concern with social stratification as a factor in the urban Reformations did not lead to a reformulation of the Moeller thesis. Heinz Schilling provided a postscript delineating a pattern of Reformation in Hanseatic cities.[155] The creativity of the thesis spawned studies treating communities beyond the imperial and free cities of *Oberdeutschland* to show that the Reformation's introduction was embedded deeply in *local* (rather than structural) political, social, and cultural circumstances. The discussion thus ended not in consensus but in fragmentation.[156] A notable area of research was that of failed urban reformations.[157]

---

[152] Bernd Moeller, *Reichsstadt und Reformation* (Gütersloh, 1962).

[153] Steven Ozment, *The Reformation in the Cities* (New Haven, 1980). For a contrasting, more complex view of the historiographical significance of Ozment's argument, see Ronald K. Rittgers, "Anxious Penitents and the Appeal of the Reformation," in *Piety and Family in Early Modern Europe* ed. Marc R. Foster and Benjamin J. Kaplan (Aldershot, 2005), 50–69.

[154] Thomas A. Brady, Jr., *Ruling Class, Regime and Reformation at Strasbourg* (Leiden, 1978).

[155] Heinz Schilling, "The Reformation in the Hanseatic Cities," *SCJ* 14 (1983), 443–46.

[156] Günter Vogler, *Nürnberg, 1524–25* (Berlin, 1982); Hans-Christoph Rublack, *Eine bürgerliche Reformation* (Gütersloh, 1982); Olaf Mörke, *Rat und Bürger in der Reformation* (Hildesheim, 1983); R. Po-Chia Hsia, *Society and Religion in Münster, 1535–1618* (New Haven, 1984); Kaspar von Greyerz, *The Late City Reformation in Germany* (Wiesbaden, 1980); Lorna Jane Abray, *The People's Reformation* (Ithaca, 1985); Rainer Postel, *Die Reformation in Hamburg, 1517–1528* (Gütersloh, 1986); Susan C. Karant-Nunn, *Zwickau in Transition, 1500–1547* (Columbus, 1987); Ulman Weiß, *Die frommen Bürger von Erfurt* (Weimar, 1988).

[157] R.W. Scribner, "Why Was There No Reformation in Cologne?" *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 49 (1976), 217–41; Hans-Christian Rublack, *Gescheiterte Reformation* (Stuttgart, 1978); Wilfried Enderle, *Konfessionsbildung und Ratsregiment in der katholischen Reichsstadt Überlingen (1500–1618)* (Stuttgart, 1990).

The debate over Moeller's proposition has been quiet since Berndt Hamm's study on Nuremberg, which also does not formulate a paradigmatic alternative; the subordination of this theme to that of "communal Reformation" in the new Cambridge History of Christianity may indicate the topic's exhaustion.[158] Stefan Ehrenpreis and Ute Lotz-Heumann, however, have recently identified Reformations in the *Landstädte* as a desideratum.[159] Work on urban chronicles of the Reformation has also drawn attention to the significance of the memory of the Reformation for urban patricians,[160] and research on wills and endowments in northern German cities tends to support Moeller by revealing the philanthropic and commemorative activities of Lübeck's and Hamburg's patriciates as continuous with their medieval sacral self-awareness.[161] A previous generation demonstrated the ways in which the cities, which were financially stronger and more cooperatively organized, nonetheless lost power over to developing territorial states as a consequence of the confessional political struggles, has not been pursued.[162] Since the 1990s, scholars have turned to related matters: intra-urban themes such as propaganda (to which Moeller made significant contributions in the 1990s),[163] social control, confessional relations, construction and allotment of physical space, and tensions around introduction and enforcement of the confessions.[164]

---

[158] Berndt Hamm, *Bürgertum und Glaube* (Göttingen, 1996); see also idem, *Lazarus Spengler (1479–1534)* (Tübingen, 2004); Peter Blickle, "Communal Reformation," in *Christianity: Reform and Expansion, 1500–1660*, ed. R. Po-Chia Hsia, pp. 75–89.

[159] Ehrenpreis and Lotz-Heumann, *Reformation und konfessionelles Zeitalter*, pp. 29–39; Johannes Merz, "Landstädte und Reformation," in *Territorien des Reiches*, 7:107–35.

[160] Susanne Rau, *Geschichte und Konfession* (Hamburg, 2002).

[161] Stefanie Rüther, *Prestige und Herrschaft* (Cologne, 2003); Gregor Rohmann, "Joachim Moller gründet ein Geschlecht," in *Macht und Memoria*, ed. Mark Hengerer (Cologne, 2005), pp. 91–130; idem, "Die Gräber der Hamburger," in *Tod und Verklärung*, ed. Arne Karsten and Philipp Zitzlsperger (Cologne, 2004), pp. 157–82.

[162] For example Thomas A. Brady, *Protestant Politics. Jacob Sturm (1489–1553) and the German Reformation* (Atlantic Highlands, 1995). See also Georg Schmidt, *Der Städtetag in der Reichsverfassung* (Stuttgart, 1984); Heinrich Richard Schmidt, *Reichsstädte, Reich und Reformation* (Stuttgart, 1986); and Christopher W. Close, "The Negotiated Reformation: Swabian Imperial Cities and Urban Reform (1530–1546)" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 2006).

[163] Mark U. Edwards, Jr., *Printing, Propaganda, and Martin Luther* (Berkeley, 1995); Bernd Moeller and Karl Stackmann, *Städtische Predigt in der Frühzeit der Reformation* (Göttingen, 1996); Allyson F. Creasman, "Side-Stepping the Censors," in *Shell Games*, ed. Mark Crane (Toronto, 2004), pp. 211–38.

[164] Thomas Max Safley, *Orphanages*; Jason P. Coy, "'Our Diligent Watches and Informers'," in *Ways of Knowing*, pp. 153–170; Christian Plath, *Konfessionskampf und Fremde Besatzung* (Münster, 2005); Renate Dürr, *Politische Kultur in der frühen Neuzeit* (Güt-

Focus now falls on other segments of the urban population, especially recipients of poor relief. "Teleological" assumptions about Protestants as organizers of the first rationally-organized lay-controlled poor relief systems originated in the controversy surrounding Otto von Bismarck's introduction of a workers' insurance system; in the era of the *Kulturkampf*, Catholics were charged with failing to care for the poor and encouraging begging.[165] In *Gesellschaft und Wirtschaft* (1914) Weber postulated a dichotomy between premodern, religious charity and modern, rationalizing charity subsequently maintained in many surveys.[166] Works in this tradition attribute associations between Protestantism and an increasingly organized relief system to the Protestant emphasis on work and vocation, economic (mercantilist) concerns about state productivity, or rising anxiety about social disorder.[167] Nonetheless, scholars now detach the beginning of this transformation from the Reformation[168] and separate its motivations from rhetoric about them, according to which iconoclasm (for example) was justified by the desire to divert monies for candles, oil, and chantries to the poor.[169] While charity distribution may have changed slightly earlier in Protestant areas, its introduction in Catholic areas suggests absence of theological opposition. Evidence from German cities now seems to confirm the conclusion that there was no significant difference in the provision of poor relief between Catholic and Protestant areas.[170] Catholic communities provided rationalized

---

ersloh, 2006); Thomas Max Safley, *Children of the Laboring Poor* (Leiden, 2005); *Stadt und Religion in der frühen Neuzeit*, eds. Vera Isaiasz et al. (Frankfurt/M, 2007); *Sacred Spaces in Early Modern Europe*, eds. Will Coster and Andrew Spicer (Cambridge, 2005); *Defining the Holy*, eds. Andrew Spicer and Sarah Hamilton (Aldershot, 2006) and *Machträume der frühneuzeitlichen Stadt*, eds. Christian Hochmuth and Susanne Rau (Konstanz, 2006).

[165] Sebastian Schmidt, "'Gott wohlgefällig und den Menschen nutzlich'," in *Norm and Praxis der Armenfürsorge in Spätmittelalter und früher Neuzeit*, ed. Sebastian Schmidt and Jens Aspelmeier (Stuttgart, 2006), pp. 61–90, pp. 61–63.

[166] Thomas Max Safley, "Introduction," in *The Reformation of Charity*, ed. idem (Leiden, 2003), pp. 1–14, esp. pp. 1–4.

[167] Harrington, "Escape from the Great Confinement," pp. 312–13.

[168] Robert Jütte, *Obrigkeitliche Armenfürsorge in deutschen Reichsstädten der frühen Neuzeit* (Cologne, 1984); Timothy Fehler, "Refashioning Poor Relief in Early Modern Emden," in *Reformation of Charity*, pp. 92–106.

[169] An exception is Ole Peter Grell, "The Religious Duty of Care and the Social Need for Control in Early Modern Europe," *Historical Journal* 39 (1996), 257–63; on justifying iconoclasm in terms of poor relief, see examples in Lee Palmer Wandel, *Voracious Idols and Violent Hands* (Cambridge, 1995).

[170] Philip L. Kinter, "Welfare, Reformation, and Dearth at Memmingen," in *Reformation of Charity*, pp. 63–75; Peer Friess, "Poor Relief and Health Care Provision in South-German Catholic Cities During the 16th Century," in ibid., pp. 76–91.

poor relief, and alms-giving did not cease in Lutheran areas, even if it lost its theological justification; people still gave alms in Nuremberg as late as 1588;[171] Lutherans still made charitable endowments to support poor students and beggars.[172] But both groups saw poverty as a threat to security and were more likely to assist the local, "deserving" poor than the itinerant, a tendency traceable to the 14th century.[173]

Slight differences between the confessions remain evident. In Catholic areas religious institutions retained more autonomy; not surprisingly, Lutheran authorities who had secularized church property had greater amounts to distribute. The Catholic poor thus encountered more institutions with a broader diversity of offerings but perhaps fewer resources. Poor relief also affected medical care, a theme that requires fuller exploration. In his work on bi-confessional Augsburg, for example, Mitchell Lewis Hammond has argued that Lutheran attitudes, specifically changes in attitudes about purgatory and the good death, encouraged family members to employ more aggressive medical measures. Lutheran authors encouraged their readers to consult medical practitioners; Hammond finds evidence this attitude reflected in care for the poor in Augsburg's Lutheran civic hospitals.[174]

Research on the urban poor connects in important ways with social disciplining. Its impetus has been Foucault's discussion of social control, the early modern disciplining of local populations, and a "Great Confinement" of marginal groups previously tolerated in poorhouses, jails, orphanages, and workhouses.[175] Foucault's ideas have been roundly rejected by most early modern historians. Work on Reformation-era madness, for example, shows that families often sought to keep mentally ill relatives at home and that both Protestant and Catholic institutions provided caring treatment rather than harsh confinement.[176] Joel

---

[171] Joel Harrington, "'Singing for His Supper': The Reinvention of Street Singing in Early Modern Nuremberg," *Social History* 22 (1997): 27–46.

[172] Andreas Gößner, *Die Studenten an der Universität Wittenberg* (Leipzig, 2003), details the persistence of this custom in endowments that benefited scholars at Wittenberg.

[173] Sebastian Schmidt treats this state of affairs nicely in a comparison between Nassau-Dillenberg and Electoral Trier in "'Gott wohlgefällig und den Menschen nutzlich'". See also Jason P. Coy, "'Earn Your Penny Elsewhere'," *Journal of Historical Sociology* 20 (2007), 279–303.

[174] Mitchell Lewis Hammond, "Medicine and Pastoral Care for the Dying in Protestant Germany," in *Ways of Knowing*, pp. 113–136.

[175] Michel Foucault, *Folie et Déraison* (Paris, 1961); idem, *Surveiller et punir. Naissance de la prison* (Paris, 1977).

[176] H.C. Erik Midelfort, *A History of Madness in Sixteenth-Century Germany* (Stanford, 1999).

Harrington, responding to both to Weber and Foucault, energetically refutes connections between poor relief and modernization, proving that the emerging turn in Nuremberg to workhouses was the culmination of medieval tendencies; it resulted from "bureaucratic momentum".

The effects of a similar late medieval momentum can be found in the quality of Lutheran relations with non-Christians, either in their midst (Jews) or on the battlefield (Turks): here the Reformation accelerated processes already underway. Recent arguments notwithstanding,[177] older secondary literature stresses that "reformation" is a mismatch when applied to the Jews,[178] a conclusion that applies especially aptly in the social realm. The Reformation emerged in the middle of a general "Exodus from the West" during the years 1420 to 1570,[179] as western European expulsions moved Jews east of the Elbe. Hence most reformers who pronounced on Jews never had sustained interactions with them.[180] Only 9% of Jewish settlements extant in the late Middle Ages continued uninterrupted into the 18th century.[181] In such an atmosphere, the idea of the Jew was instrumentalized for various purposes which Lutheran theology affected only slightly, eliminating charges of host desecration associated with transubstantiation miracles, for example,[182] but intensifying discourses about the Jews and Israel in connection with transgressing Christian congregations.[183] Libels not influenced by theological change, however, like blasphemy and deicide, persisted. Recent studies of this instrumentalization have turned from the role of the Jew in Lutheran theology to Christian ethnographies of Judaism.[184]

---

[177] Dean Phillip Bell and Stephen G. Burnett, "Introduction," in *Jews, Judaism*, pp. xxi–xxxi. On periodizing Jewish history, see Dean Phillip Bell, *Jews in the Early Modern World* (Lanham, 2007), pp. 2–10.

[178] See the literature cited in Bell, "Jewish Settlement, Politics, and the Reformation," in *Jews, Judaism*, pp. 421–50, at pp. 423–24.

[179] Jonathan Israel, *European Jewry in the Age of Mercantilism, 1550–1700* (Oxford, 1985), pp. 5–34.

[180] Achim Detmers, "Calvin, the Jews, and Judaism," in *Jews, Judaism*, pp. 197–217, p. 200.

[181] Michael Toch, "Siedlungsstruktur der Juden Mitteleuropas im Wandel vom Mittelalter zur Neuzeit," in *Juden in der christlichen Umwelt während des späten Mittelalters*, ed. Alfred Haverkamp and Franz-Josef Ziwes (Berlin, 1992), p. 37; Bell, *Jews in the Early Modern World*, pp. 46–50.

[182] R. Po-Chia Hsia, *The Myth of Ritual Murder* (New Haven, 1988).

[183] Susan R. Boettcher, "Preliminary Considerations".

[184] R. Po-Chia Hsia, "Christian Ethnographies of Jews in Early Modern Germany," in *The Expulsion of the Jew*, ed. Raymond B. Waddington and A.H. Williamson (New York, 1994), pp. 223–35; Stephen G. Burnett, "Distorted Mirrors. Antonius Margaritha, Johannes Buxtorf, and Christian Ethnographies of the Jews," *SCJ* 25 (1994), 275–87; Yaacov Deutsch, "Polemical Ethnographies," in *Hebraica Veritas*, ed. Allison P. Coudert

Regarding the Jews' social position, it is not clear that the reformers' statements directly affected social arrangements either within the Jewish community (where they were controlled by elders)[185] or as imposed upon it (where they were negotiated between city authorities, local sovereigns, and sometimes the emperor).[186] Because of the influence of these negotiations on residence privileges, however, Lutheranism's disruption of traditional urban-imperial hierarchies may have had ripple effects on Jewish political status in the imperial cities.[187]

Most social histories of German Jewry stress regional and local perspectives in which the Reformation does not play a causal role.[188] The reversal of eastward migration after the 1570s has been attributed to increasing secularism as a result of confessional plurality,[189] but the Khmelnytsky Massacres (1648) also played a role. Increased presence of Jewish communities did not necessarily herald increased acceptance; some argue that confessionalization intensified anti-Jewish sentiments in the Reich.[190] Indeed, although the reformers had in some cases called for toleration, in the end, Lutherans became just as industrious as Catholics in urging conversions, which often removed Jews from the supportive network of their families of origin while failing to provide them with new social ties necessary for them to obtain work.[191]

The Lutheran attitude toward and treatment of "the Turk" similarly fits into a larger, older pattern. The Reformation emerged into a

---

and Jeffrey S. Shoulson (Philadelphia, 2004), pp. 202–33; idem, "Von der Juden Ceremonien," in *Jews, Judaism*, pp. 335–56.

[185] Dean Bell, *Sacred Communities* (Boston, 2001); Bell, *Jews in the Early Modern World*, pp. 93–115.

[186] Bell, "Jewish Settlement," pp. 434–438; *In and Out of the Ghetto*, eds. R. Po-Chia Hsia and Hartmut Lehmann (Cambridge, 1995).

[187] Miriam Bodian, "Christianity and Judaism," in *Christianity: Reform and Expansion*, pp. 483–503, pp. 491–92.

[188] Rotraud Ries, *Jüdisches Leben in Niedersachsen im 15. und 16. Jahrhundert* (Hannover, 1994); Klaus Pohlmann, *Juden in Lippe in Mittelalter und Früher Neuzeit. Zwischen Pogrom und Vertreibung, 1350–1614* (Detmold, 1995); Bernd-Wilhelm Linnemeier, *Jüdisches Leben im Alten Reich* (Bielefeld, 2002); J. Friedrich Battenberg, *Die Juden in Deutschland vom 16. bis zum Ende des 18. Jahrhunderts* (Munich, 2001); Stefan Litt, *Juden in Thüringen in der frühen Neuzeit* (Cologne, 2003).

[189] Israel, *European Jewry*, pp. 35–38.

[190] Rotraud Ries, "Zur Bedeutung von Reformation und Konfessionalisierung für das christlich-jüdische Verhältnis in Niedersachsen," *Aschkenas* 6 (1996), 353–419.

[191] Elisheva Carlebach, *Divided Souls* (New Haven, 2001). For a valuable study from a different perspective, see Michael J. Halvorson, "Lutherans Baptizing Jews," in *Defining Community in Early Modern Europe*, ed. idem and Karen Spierling (Aldershot, forthcoming).

Christian-Muslim relationship controlled by the advance of Ottoman armies through southeastern Europe after the fall of Constantinople (1453). Ottoman victories at Mohacs (1526) and Buda (1541) and active interventions in eastern European politics coincided with growing political tension in the Reich over religious controversies, so that allotment of the tax burden of defense against the Turks became a regular, even decisive, element of Lutheran bargaining for discussion of religion at the imperial diets of the period.[192] Stephen Fischer-Galati argued that the Turkish problem kept the Reformation alive by preventing Charles V from enforcing the Edict of Worms.[193] The image of the Turk was also instrumentalized in the literature of the period, for religious and political ends as an aspect of confessionalization, and (as with the Jews) in polemical ethnographies.[194] Literature on the social aspects of the Turkish-Christian interactions in western European languages is virtually nonexistent, as is discussion of the Turkish perspective. We know that the Turkish governors of Hungary were not usually inclined to prohibit the spread of Protestantism of any stripe, not did they have a regime-wide policy toward Christian churches, but that they provoked intra-Christian controversy between Catholics, Protestants, Radicals, and Orthodox Christians in order to hamper Christian revolts against Ottoman rule.[195]

Significant Social Change in the Lutheran Reformation

The picture of gradual social change sketched above contests the sweeping claims of the "teleological" arguments. Still, "descriptive" research reveals social matters that *were* significantly affected by the Lutheran Reformation. A discussion of the social order not treated above—the clergy—offers the best entry into this discussion. Of any social group,

---

[192] Wolfgang Steglich, "Über die Reichstürkenhilfe in der Zeit Karls V." *Militärgeschichtliche Mitteilungen* 1 (1972), 1–55; Winfried Schulze, *Reich und Türkengefahr im späten 16. Jahrhundert* (Munich, 1978), pp. 67–219.

[193] Stephen A. Fischer-Galati, *Ottoman Imperialism and German Protestantism, 1521–1555* (Cambridge, MA, 1959).

[194] Almut Höfert, *Den Feind beschreiben* (Frankfurt/M, 2003); Susan R. Boettcher, "Confessional Preaching in Times of Crisis," *Comparative Studies in South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 24 (2004), 101–15.

[195] István György Tóth, "Between Islam and Orthodoxy," in *Christianity: Reform and Expansion*, pp. 536–57, pp. 537–40.

parish clergy were the most likely to experience the Lutheran Reformation's social effects: changes to their legal status and expropriations in the face of state-building, and the substitution of married clergy (and the parsonage household) for the ideal (if not always the reality)[196] of celibacy. Consequently, the effect on this group is among the most significant social evidence cited to support notions of the Reformation as a rupture.[197] These transformations affected not only the generation of clergy that witnessed the Lutheran Reformation but also shaped their successors' social roles in ways criticized in the "teleological" research. So the Reformation's impact on the clergy is an important test for judgments on the merits of the "teleological" and "descriptive" literature. Treatments of this theme must consider not only parish clergy, of course, but also the cloistered, whose fates are often neglected, as religious communities served important social functions: creating working productive units and collecting taxes; aiding salvation by cultivating *memoria*, the regular, ritualized prayer for dead relatives and donors to the cloister;[198] organizing pious endowments and providing formal and informal poor relief, especially in urban areas, where they sometimes operated hospitals for pilgrims and the poor;[199] preserving inheritances and cementing dynastic relationships via the placement of surplus offspring sons and daughters in significant positions;[200] organizing learning and homiletical education. Given the challenge that dissolution posed not only to private religiosity but also to arrangements in the realms of property, social practice, poor relief, dynastic arrangements and education, it—along with the related call for the abandonment of celibacy among the clergy and the introduction of clerical marriage—must be seen as fundamental to the most wide-reaching social transformation

[196] Buckwalter, *Priesterehe*, pp. 26–30.

[197] Kaufmann, "Konfessionalisierung," p. 1118.

[198] Otto Gerhard Oexle, "Die Gegenwart der Toten," in *Death in the Middle Ages*, ed. Herman Braet and Werner Verbeke (Louvain, 1983), pp. 19–77; idem, "Memoria und Memorialüberlieferung im frühen Mittelalter," *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 10 (1976), 70–95; Patrick J. Geary, *Living with the Dead in the Middle Ages* (Ithaca, 1994), pp. 77–92.

[199] Anne-Marie Windemuth, *Das Hospital als Träger der Armenfürsorge im Mittelalter* (Stuttgart, 1995); Ernst-Adolf Meinert, *Die Hospitäler Holsteins im Mittelalter* (Neumünster, 1997).

[200] Karl-Heinz Spieß, *Familie und Verwandtschaft im deutschen Hochadel des Spätmittelalters* (Stuttgart, 1993), pp. 327–30; Brigitte Klosterberg, *Zur Ehre Gottes und zum Wohl der Familie* (Cologne, 1995), p. 222.

of the Reformation. Its impact on the individuals caught up in these transformations was no less significant.[201]

Schorn-Schütte's results are also significant for the body of descriptive research. Her analysis of the rooting of the Protestant clergy in the *Bürgertum*, for example, explains the development of this group from a class rather than from specific clerical "dynasties,"[202] allowing meaningful penetration from non-clerical families, although other authors have emphasized the role of family groups in intensifying confessionalization.[203] Moreover, she points to conflict between the clergy's social status and function and its self-understanding as a group separate from both the nobility and other commoners; she attributes this conflict to structural problems in the formation of the office as a mediating instance to God that nonetheless rejected medieval notions of this relationship.[204] She orders this group awareness as a factor influencing the development of the parsonage as a social model for the Lutheran household well into the 19th century although research about the *Pfarrhaus* and its other important member, the *Pfarrfrau*, is still in its infancy, especially for the 16th and 17th centuries.[205] Schorn-Schütte has also advanced the comparative study of European Protestant clergies.[206]

---

[201] Antje Rüttgardt, *Klosteraustritte in der frühen Reformation* (Gütersloh, 2007).

[202] Schorn-Schütte, *Evangelische Geistlichkeit*, p. 452.

[203] Julian Kümmerle, "Wissenschaft und Verwandtschaft," in *Bildung und Konfession*, ed. Herman J. Selderhuis and Markus Wriedt (Tübingen, 2006), pp. 160–210.

[204] Schorn-Schütte, *Evangelische Geistlichkeit*, p. 454.

[205] Martin Greiffenhagen, *Das evangelische Pfarrhaus* (Stuttgart, 1983); Nicolaus Heutger, *Das evangelische Pfarrhaus in Niedersachsen* (Frankfurt/M, 1990); Schorn-Schütte, *Evangelische Geistlichkeit*, pp. 287–330. On the pastor's wife, see Schorn-Schütte, "'Gefährtin und Mitregentin'," in *Wandel der Geschlechterbeziehungen zu Beginn der Neuzeit*, ed. Heide Wunder and Christina Vanja (Frankfurt/M, 1991), pp. 109–53; idem, "Pfarrfrauen in der hansestädtischen Gesellschaft der frühen Neuzeit," in *Frauen in der Ständegesellschaft*, ed. Barbara Vogel and Ulrike Weckel (Hamburg, 1991), pp. 201–25; idem, "Matrimony as Profession: The Clergyman's Wife," in *Time and Space in Women's Lives* (Bologna, 1999), pp. 255–77.

[206] For a programmatic statement, see Luise Schorn-Schütte, "Priest, Preacher, Pastor. Research on Clerical Office in Early Modern Europe," *Central European History* 33 (2000), 1–39; see also her "'Das Predigtamt ist nicht ein hofe Diener oder bauern knecht'. Überlegungen zu einer Sozialbiographie protestantischer Pfarrer in der Frühneuzeit," in *Problems in the Historical Anthropology of Religion in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Bob Scribner and R. Po-Chia Hsia (Wolfenbüttel, 1997), pp. 263–85; idem, "The Evangelical Clergy of Early Modern History," in *The Protestant Clergy of Early Modern Europe*, ed. idem and C. Scott Dixon (London, 2003), pp. 1–38, and "The New Clergies," in *Christianity. Reform and Expansion*, pp. 444–64.

Even so, our knowledge about the complex of issues around this quintessentially Lutheran group remains limited. Though the situation is changing, primarily in response to Rosi Fuhrmann and Enno Bünz,[207] it is plagued particularly by minimal awareness of the comparative social situation, both material and ideal, of the non-urban late medieval German secular clergy. More evidence is needed here; the professional preparation of the late medieval urban clergy was not as deficient as often assumed,[208] and analysis of programmatic statements about the novelty of pastoral training, like Marcel Nieden's, will not provide convincing evident to most social historians, who are more interested in actual circumstance than ideal conceptions.[209] Certainly, the educational level of the post-Reformation clergy rose; future pastors flocked to certain "approved" institutions,[210] aided by the creation of scholarships.[211] Research on the political and social circumstances of Lutheran court preachers is also at an early stage.[212] Most studies of pastors are not complimented by comparative social analysis of the other groups of officials within the church, especially lower officials; moreover, following Schorn-Schütte's lead, the social role of confessional-era pastors as civil servants needs to be compared more consistently with that of other non-ecclesiastical officials. Doing so would shed more light on

[207] Among the many works of Enno Bünz, especially "Thüringens Pfarrgeistlichkeit vor der Reformation," *HJ* 124 (2004), 45–75; idem, *Das Mainzer Subsidienregister für Thüringen von 1506* (Cologne, 2005); idem, "Pfründenwerte nordelbischer Pfarreien im späten Mittelalter," in *Vielfalt und Aktualität des Mittelalters*, ed. Sabine Arend et al. (Bielefeld, 2006), pp. 281–313; Rosi Fuhrmann, *Kirche und Dorf* (Stuttgart, 1995); idem, "Dorfgemeinde und Pfründstiftung vor der Reformation. Kommunale Selbstbestimmungschancen zwischen Religion und Recht," in *Kommunalisierung und Christianisierung*, ed. Peter Blickle und Johannes Kunisch (Berlin 1989), pp. 77–112; Sabine Todt, *Kleruskritik, Frömmigkeit und Kommunikation in Worms im Mittelalter und in der Reformationszeit* (Stuttgart, 2005) and Bengt Büttner, *Die Pfarreien der Insel Rügen* (Cologne, 2007).

[208] Rainer Postel, "Hamburger Theologenausbildung vor und nach der Reformation," in *Bildung und Konfession*, pp. 51–60.

[209] Marcel Nieden, *Die Erfindung des Theologen* (Tübingen, 2007).

[210] Johannes Kistenich, "Studienorte der in den Grafschaften Mark und Ravensberg während des 16. Jahrhunderts tätigen lutherischen Geistlichen," in *Bildung und Konfession*, pp. 103–29.

[211] Gößner, *Die Studenten an der Universität Wittenberg*.

[212] Luise Schorn-Schütte, "Prediger an protestantischen Höfen der Frühneuzeit," in *Bürgerlichen Eliten in den Niederlanden und in Nordwestdeutschland*, ed. Heinz Schilling (Cologne, 1985), pp. 275–336; Wolfgang Sommer, "Die Stellung lutherischer Hofprediger im Herausbildungsprozeß frühmoderner Staatlichkeit und Gesellschaft," *ZKG* 106 (1995), 213–28; idem, "Johann Reinhard Hedinger als Hofprediger in Stuttgart," *Pietismus und Neuzeit* 24 (1998), 160–85; idem, *Gottesfurcht und Fürstenherrschaft* (Göttingen, 1998); idem, *Die lutherischen Hofprediger in Dresden* (Stuttgart, 2006); Joachim Hahn, *Zeitgeschehen im Spiegel der lutherischen Predigt nach dem Dreißigjährigen Krieg* (Leipzig, 2005).

the teleological problem Schorn-Schütte addresses, the matter of the social factors that influenced the Lutheran clergy's relative relationship to state authority. While her results are promising, if they are to stand as a definitive refutation of Troeltsch, they will need to find further resonance in other local studies.

No other research has yet approached the definitiveness or scope of Schorn-Schütte's although some focus on aspects of the issue, especially education,[213] the qualifications of pastoral candidates,[214] pastors as agents of acculturation,[215] and participation in discipline. Jonathan Strom, for example, affirms Schorn-Schütte's claims about the independent self-awareness of the clergy and their open political and social critiques and finds that Rostock's late Orthodox preachers furthered moral reform in ways independent of confessionalizing imperatives.[216] Schorn-Schütte's account tends to see parish-pastoral conflict as often the result of local issues rather than structural matters. A different emphasis emerges in micro-histories of the Lutheran clergy that focus on parish-level conflict. These studies, while discussing the details of local conflicts, tend to see both pastor and parish as heavily influenced by structural and administrative difficulties. Initial elements of James Goodale's work on relationships between pastors and congregations in Saxony reveal pastor-parish struggles centered on financial and material issues with local outcomes but structural causes.[217]

A subsidiary point is the field of education in its various forms since the disruption of monastic life also influenced every level of education. Results on the social composition, status, prestige, and activities of the Lutheran professoriate are increasingly available,[218] including comparative discussion of their salaries, which in many institutions

---

[213] Schorn-Schütte, *Evangelische Geistlichkeit*, pp. 213–25; Sven Tode, "Bildung und Wissenskultur der Geistlichkeit im Danzig der Frühen Neuzeit," in *Bildung und Konfession*, pp. 61–101; Kistenich, "Studienorte".

[214] Frank Kleinehagenbrock, "'Ansehnliche' und 'geübte' Personen für die Seelsorge an der Grenze zum Papsttum," in *Bildung und Konfession*, pp. 131–57.

[215] Martin Klöker, *Literarisches Leben in Reval in der ersten Hälfte des 17. Jahrhunderts (1600–1657)*, 2 vols (Tübingen, 2005) traces a shift in the center of Tallinn's intellectual life from pastors to professors in the mid-17th century.

[216] Jonathan Strom, *Orthodoxy and Reform* (Tübingen, 1999).

[217] Jay Goodale, "Pfarrer als Außenseiter," *Historische Anthropologie* 7 (1999), 191–211; idem, "Pastors, Privation, and the Process of Reformation in Saxony," *SCJ* 33 (2002), 71–92; idem, "The Clergyman between the Cultures of State and Parish," in *Social History of the Protestant Clergy*, pp. 100–19; 221–26. See also the similar project of Frank Fätkenheuer, *Lebenswelt und Religion* (Göttingen, 2004).

[218] Thomas Kaufmann, *Universität und lutherische Konfessionalisierung* (Gütersloh, 1999).

were superior to those of other civil servants.[219] Much of our current knowledge stems from Thomas Kaufmann's prosopography of Rostock professors. Although it is difficult to define the category of "professor," based on Kaufmann's results, drawn on data from funeral sermons, the professoriate in theology seems somewhat less likely than the Lutheran pastorate to have been a family affair even if it was almost exclusively drawn from the *Bürgertum*.[220] The professoriate seems to have been a more geographically mobile group than the pastorate. Current studies, like Kaufmann's, are oriented toward the role of the professoriate in confessionalization. Less discussion has concerned connections of such research to modern history debates over the relationship between the social position of German professionals and their political sympathies and activities although such discussions in turn also neglect theology professors.[221] Kaufmann finds that, like Schorn-Schütte's pastors, professors followed their own self-understanding rather than conforming to the dictates of the authorities; unlike pastors, who sustained religious discourse in the face of secular social initiatives, however, he finds the professoriate participated in de-confessionalization toward the end of the 17th century.[222]

Equally significant in terms of its effect on social arrangements, and under-researched for Lutheran areas, is the development of vernacular schools for the laity, especially in the countryside, where such schools were scarce between before the Reformation.[223] Territorial rulers gave rural and lay schools low priority in comparison to universities and clerical education; church ordinances reveal that their creation was much slower.[224] The most well-known study is that of Gerald Strauss, who drew on visitation records to assert a failure of Lutheran schools to transmit doctrine successfully; he was countered by James Kittelson's description of successful catechesis in Strasbourg.[225] The situation is much better researched for Calvinist areas (Calvinist sovereigns in Nassau and Hesse

[219] Peter Baumgart, *Universitäten im konfessionellen Zeitalter* (Münster, 2006), pp. 273–95.
[220] Kaufmann, *Universität*, p. 153, n. 46.
[221] James C. Albisetti, "*The Decline of the German Mandarins* after Twenty-Five Years," *History of Education Quarterly* 34 (1994), 453–65.
[222] Kaufmann, *Universität*, pp. 609–13.
[223] Felicitas Schmieder, "'Wenn Du Kinder hast, erziehe sie,' spricht Salomo," in *Regionale Aspekte des frühen Schulwesens*, ed. Kurt Andermann and Ulrich Andermann (Tübingen 2000), pp. 9–28.
[224] Sebastian Kreiker, *Armut, Schule, Obrigkeit* (Bielefeld, 1997).
[225] See citations in n. 18 above.

were more proactive in establishing and staffing such systems)[226] and it may be that the establishment of schools fit more effectively into the Calvinist emphasis on discipline[227] although the subfield has generally reversed judgments about early modern pedagogy relying on Elias's "civilizing process".[228] Only fragmentary information is available from the children's perspective.[229] In any case, we await newer studies of access to schools and school fees and the concrete conduct and result of Lutheran catechesis as well as prosopographical studies of Lutheran teachers, which would provide bridges to the long-standing discussion of Protestant schooling and schoolteachers in German national development (and their supposed conservatism).[230] Moreover, more information about these schools would also expand our knowledge of the gradual transition from oral to literate culture among Germany's peasants.[231] Cross-fertilization—in pedagogical theory and in textbooks—between the confessions,[232] as well as intermittent confessional change in some territories, however, will certainly the complicate the picture of the outcomes of a specifically Lutheran school education.

The second place where scholars can point to significant social transformation as a result of the Lutheran Reformation, even if we cannot quite agree upon its quality, is in the area of female status and gender relations. When gender factors were introduced into the social history of the Reformation two generations ago, many thought them peripheral; today, study after study reveals the enmeshment of gender factors in Reformation-era social change, implicating it in matters as diverse as urban social discipline, statebuilding, and economic development.[233] Even if cultural changes were underway in notions of female roles

---

[226] Gerhard Menk, "Territorialstaat und Schulwesen in der frühen Neuzeit," *Jahrbuch für westdeutsche Landesgeschichte* 9 (1983), 177–220; idem, "Das frühneuzeitliche Bildungs- und Schulwesen im Bereich des heutigen Hessen," in *Regionale Aspekte des frühen Schulwesens* (Tübingen 2000), pp. 153–99.

[227] Geoffrey Parker, "Success and Failure".

[228] Stefan Ehrenpreis, "Einleitung," in *Frühneuzeitliche Bildungsgeschichte der Reformierten in konfessionvergleichender Perspektive*, ed. Heinz Schilling and Stefan Ehrenpreis (Berlin, 2006), pp. 1–17.

[229] Jan Peters, "Beamtenkinder," in *Kindheit und Jugend in der Neuzeit 1500–1900*, ed. Werner Buchholz (Stuttgart 2000), pp. 131–46.

[230] Anthony J. LaVopa, *Prussian Schoolteachers* (Chapel Hill, 1980).

[231] Ehrenpreis and Lotz-Heumann, *Reformation und konfessionelles Zeitalter*, p. 48.

[232] Stefan Ehrenpreis, "Teaching Religion in Early Modern Europe," in *Religion and Cultural Exchange in Europe 1400–1700*, ed. Heinz Schilling and Istvan Tóth (Cambridge, 2006).

[233] Roper, *The Holy Household*; Strasser, *State of Virginity*; Ogilvie, *A Bitter Living*.

before the Reformation, and medieval society and religious thought was already highly patriarchal (so that it is not clear that the Reformation's ideological changes were more than an intensification, reaccentuation, or even a realization of medieval ideals),[234] scholars agree that the Reformation laid the way for a distinctive, persistent construction of the household and women's roles within it.[235] It has long been clear that a flood of prescriptive literature urged fathers to assume responsibility for the education of their households.[236] (In essence, this push involved the transfer of values usually related to urban bourgeois families to wider society, but the pro-family mood has not been studied as a class issue specifically.)

The road to broader awareness of the significance of gender factors has been long. Older historiography prioritized individual over social notions of freedom. Thus, theological changes to the meaning of *Beruf* and *Stand* stemming from the Reformation idea that a secular calling was as legitimate as a religious one meant that "freeing" women from cloisters improved their status.[237] Second-wave feminist influence on Reformation scholarship revised such notions about the nature of women's freedom. This work concluded that the dissolution of the cloisters reduced available options for women. Since most work available to them was organized in households,[238] the cloister was the only attractive option for unmarried women who wanted to retain personal autonomy. Closing cloisters meant blocking the only life path that diverged from reproductive labor and contributions to the family economy.[239] Women could still become learned, but women like Katherina Zell or Ursula von Grumbach experienced the first generation of the Reformation; later Lutheranism scorned women martyrs and prophetesses. Not all

[234] Mickey Mattox, "*Defender of the Most Holy Matriarchs*" (Leiden, 2003); Beth Kreitzer, *Reforming Mary* (Oxford, 2004).

[235] Steven Ozment, *When Fathers Ruled*; Lyndal Roper, *The Holy Household*; Joel F. Harrington, "*Hausvater* und *Landesvater*," *Central European History* 25 (1992), 52–75.

[236] Julius Hoffmann, *Die "Hausväterliteratur" und "die Predigten über den christlichen Hausstand"* (Weinheim, 1959).

[237] Roland Bainton, *Women of the Reformation in Germany and Italy* (Minneapolis, 1971); Steven Ozment, *When Fathers Ruled*; Lewis W. Spitz, *The Protestant Reformation 1517–1559* (New York, 1985), p. 354.

[238] Merry Wiesner, *Working Women in Renaissance Germany* (New Brunswick, 1986).

[239] S.M. Wyntjes, "Women in the Reformation Era," in *Becoming Visible*, ed. Renate Bridenthal and Claudia Koonz (Boston, 1977), Natalie Zemon Davis, "City Women and Religious Change," in idem, *Society and Culture in Early Modern France* (London, 1975).

women could attain the new roles of "religious polemicist, pastor's wife, domestic missionary, philanthropist, [and] martyr,"[240] and many late medieval female pieties were prohibited. Ritual decisions, such as the retention of churching (which implicitly sustained notions of female impurity based on ritual separation) may also signal women's deteriorating (or certainly not improving) religious status.[241] The age's growing fascination with witchcraft and witch-hunting, often seen as a gender issue,[242] has never been convincingly linked to confessional allegiances but rather to the sympathies of Baroque religion in general.[243] Moreover, although Lutheran apocalypticism certainly did not dampen the heated cultural discourse about Satan, Wolfgang Behringer locates initial Protestant demonologies in Reformed circles, noting that contemporary Catholics tended to accuse Protestants of skepticism about witchcraft.[244] Alison Rowlands argues that although relatively few accusations were made in Lutheran Rothenburg, still the specifically Lutheran view of women and mothers played a role in witch persecution.[245]

More recent feminist critiques that alerted scholars to the sustained centrality of class and culture in influencing women's choices have also found their way into Reformation history. A recent school of thought follows Lyndal Roper's mention that the role of nun was available only to small, well-off segments of society.[246] Demographic statistics suggest that the average woman who lived to adulthood before the Reformation became a wife and mother (7–10 full-term pregnancies were average) and that this experience did not change afterwards. In light of this information, the argument that Catholic theology made it easier to accept such mortality than Protestant teachings is not entirely convincing.[247] Indeed, Ute Gause suggests that in a situation of high fertility and high child mortality the Lutheran turn from the teaching

---

[240] Merry E. Wiesner, *Women and Gender in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 1998), p. 192.

[241] Susan C. Karant-Nunn, *The Reformation of Ritual* (London, 1997), pp. 72–90.

[242] Lara Apps and Andrew Colin Gow, *Male Witches in Early Modern Europe* (Manchester, 2003).

[243] Lyndal Roper, *Witch Craze* (New Haven, 2004).

[244] Wolfgang Behringer, "Demonology," in *Christianity: Reform and Expansion*, pp. 406–24.

[245] Alison Rowlands, *Witchcraft Narratives in Germany* (Manchester, 2003).

[246] Lyndal Roper, *The Holy Household*, pp. 206–07.

[247] Philippe Ariès, *Centuries of Childhood* (New York, 1962); Arthur E. Imhof, *Lost Worlds* (Charlottesville, 1988).

on the *limbus infantorum* improved women's situation. Questions of the relationship between ideal and reality continue to vex us, however, for the Reformation also introduced new midwives' ordinances to prevent some earlier superstitious practices that might have been comforting to parturients.[248]

The key role newly established for Lutheran women was that of pastor's wife (*Pfarrfrau*). Schorn-Schütte argues, for example, that pastor's wives were co-rulers of the parsonage household.[249] Whether or not most pastors' wives achieved this status, the parsonage household was intended as a social ideal. The connection between it and the cloistered community it replaced was made explicit in some sermons,[250] as were links between fathers and secular rulers.[251] Much of the well-meant rhetoric was flowery.[252] Still, did the intensification of propaganda in support of the family lead to concrete social changes? Most studies of this question center on the development and enforcement of marital law. Safley notes significant continuities with canon law judgments in southwest German marital courts.[253] Joel Harrington finds that in the short term Protestant territories prosecuted marriage cases no more aggressively than in the Middle Ages[254] although for a later period Terence McIntoch finds a definite intensification in prosecutions of premarital sex in Lutheran territories.[255] Safley also notes the tendency of women to initiate court cases although such activity seems to have been more frequent among Reformed than Lutheran women. Demographic research on family planning may also shed limited light on the Lutheran family. It has been argued that Protestants adopted family planning

---

[248] Gause, *Kirchengeschichte und Genderforschung*, pp. 121–51.

[249] See citations in n. 202.

[250] Susan C. *Karant-Nunn*, "Reformation und Askese. Das Pfarrhaus als evangelisches Kloster," Lecture at the Institut für Europäische Geschichte, Mainz, 1 June 2006.

[251] Harrington, "*Hausvater* und *Landesvater*".

[252] Susan C. Karant-Nunn, "'Fragrant Wedding Roses': Lutheran Wedding Sermons and Gender Definition in Early Modern Germany," *German History* 17 (1999), 25–40.

[253] Safley, *Let No Man Put Asunder*.

[254] Joel Harrington, *Reordering Marriage and Society in Reformation Germany* (Cambridge, 1995).

[255] Terence L. McIntosh, "Confessionalization and the Campaign against Pre-Nuptial Coitus in Early Modern Germany," in *Confessionalization in Europe, 1555–1700*, ed. John M. Headley et al. (Aldershot, 2004), pp. 155–74.

first;[256] Etienne François has shown that after 1648, Protestants and Catholics in Augsburg displayed divergent demographic patterns.[257]

Gender history of the Reformation has tended to focus on women, perhaps because the dissolution of the cloisters is seen as more heavily affecting women than men. The presumed changes in women's lives (from celibacy to sexual intercourse, childbearing and motherhood) were more apparent. Study of men and masculinity in the Reformation has thus been quieter. Because of the continuity in medieval and Reformation notions of patriarchy, gender roles of men are seen as less obviously influenced by the Reformation. Still, counter-arguments are available. Even if men did not bear children, the closing of cloisters certainly blocked a meaningful path of education for some, and most ideologies have effects on those who exercise them as well as their objects. A gender history of men or masculinity in the Lutheran Reformation that compares with the extensive studies of women's experiences must be considered the largest current lacuna in this area. It would be helpful if such research would focus explicitly on the semantic coding of femininity and masculinity, especially visual issues like clerical dress. Finally, very little discussion of "deviant" gender notions has entered social history research. Helmut Puff notes that while the Reformation did not lead to change in actual treatment of homosexuals, discourse about sodomy intensified in vehemence (and grew to be identified with Catholicism) due to the intensification of the pro-family push.[258]

---

[256] See Robert Jütte, *Lust ohne Last* (Munich, 2003) on the idea that Protestant ideas about the relationship of marriage to sexual pleasure allowed couples to practice contraceptive strategies with less guilt and led to marital use of strategies used previously only by unmarried partners. In Switzerland birth rates in Protestant birth areas began to drop about a century before those in Catholic areas; see Alfred Perrenoud, "Malthusianisme et protestantisme: un modèle demographique weberien," *Annales ESC* 29 (1974), 975–988. On potential contraceptive strategies in Protestant marriages see Ulrich Pfister, *Die Anfänge von Geburtenbeschränkung* (Frankfurt/M, 1985), although the focus on Zürich provides only suggestive evidence for Lutheran behavior. On similar behavior in Lutheran families, see Peter Zschunke, *Konfession und Alltag in Oppenheim* (Wiesbaden, 1984), pp. 198–226. Other studies are discussed in De Vries, "Population," p. 26. Benz, p. 54, says that informal contraception ("stopping") did not cross the Rhine boundary and that German fertility was mainly conditioned by the ability of the partners to continue conceiving ("natural fertility," which meant that conception ended with the cessation of menses around 40 years of age).

[257] Etienne François, *Die unsichtbare Grenze. Protestanten und Katholiken in Augsburg 1648–1806* (Sigmaringen, 1991), pp. 33–72.

[258] Helmut Puff, *Sodomy in Reformation Germany and Switzerland, 1400–1600* (Chicago, 2003).

Perspectives and Conclusions

As we have seen, though all but extinct, the *Damenstift* is perhaps more representative of the pattern of gradual social change hampered by circumstance under Lutheranism than the strongly ruptural introduction of a married clergy although the latter was undoubtedly more broadly significant. Still, the synergy between confessional allegiances, narratives influenced by the German national project, and the response to modernity incorporated in the "teleological" scholarship had field-defining consequences for the postwar development of social history research on the Reformation, so that the thesis of rupture predominated until recently. Confessional and teleological approaches occupied Reformation researchers into the mid-1970s, beyond the point at which social history was firmly established elsewhere. Social history's delayed deployment, along with the lack of interest in *Annales* approaches in West Germany,[259] meant that the "new cultural history" now dominant in early modern historiography "arrived" before empirical social history had been fully exploited.[260] Reflective of this state of affairs is Mack Holt's description of the achievements of Reformation social history, which discusses the urban Reformations, marriage/gender, the laity and confessionalization before proposing that future social histories should treat ritual, the transmission of ideas, reading, and art, all themes influenced by the cultural turn.[261] The themes Holt names would all benefit from a more fruitful cooperation between historical theologians and social historians, one that incorporates both perspectives as fully as possible.

Admittedly, contemporary cultural history of the Reformation has only been moderately influenced by the "linguistic turn;" most current cultural histories include some discussion of social factors. Nonetheless, gaps in our knowledge of the social aspects and impact of the Reformation remain. Many themes Thomas Brady mentioned as desiderata when he delineated the "teleological"/"descriptive" divide, remain almost untouched, including the material and financial conditions of late medieval and Reformation parishes and the social (as opposed to

[259] Lutz Raphael, "Trotzige Ablehnung, produktive Mißverständnisse und verborgene Affinitäten," in: *Geschichtswissenschaft um 1950*, ed. Heinz Duchhardt and Gerhard May (Mainz, 2002), pp. 65–80.

[260] A useful, broad-spectrum account of this transition is Geoff Eley, *A Crooked Line: From Cultural History to the History of Society* (Ann Arbor, 2005).

[261] Holt, "Social History".

discursive) components of anti-clericalism.[262] Stefan Ehrenpreis and Ute Lotz-Heumann have also identified the contributions of social groups from the "second row" of the Reformation as worthy of study,[263] a view confirmed by the near absence of schoolteachers, *Stadtschreiber*, bureaucrats, and lower court officials from the account offered above. I would add the social components of some subjects on the border between social and cultural history, such as the material culture of Lutheran books, pews, devotionalia, liturgical objects, and clerical clothing styles, with a particular focus on their production, cost, ownership, methods of transfer and use in private and public settings. In this context, the study of Lutheran funeral and commemorative practices is already bearing fruit,[264] as is the discussion of the confessional use of architectural space.[265] Strongly influenced by the new cultural history, these areas might be strengthened by greater attention to the social "nitty gritty" and by a more explicit discussion of historical theology. More attention to the legal aspects of social change in Lutheran areas, particularly among Anglophone researchers, would also be welcome, as would a renewed discussion of social components of religious violence outside of the familiar areas of *Bauernkrieg* and iconoclasm. Social factors in conversion decisions need more investigation.[266] Studies of social factors in inter-confessional and inter-religious encounters already underway also have much to teach us about the social outcomes of confession.[267] The emerging fields of cultural transfer and transnationalism also offer opportunities to the social historian.

Holes in our knowledge are not worth filling just because they exist; rather, we must find reasons to justify filling them. As Brady wrote,

> What social developments were hindered, promoted, blocked, or shifted by the Reformation? . . . Here lie the roots and the breeding grounds of all current debates. Some historians feel this enterprise is futile or even harmful, arguing either that such notions are purely subjective or that . . . the

[262] Brady, "Social History," p. 175.

[263] Ehrenpreis and Lotz-Heumann, *Reformation und konfessionelles Zeitalter*, p. 114.

[264] In addition to the literature above, see Craig Koslofsky, *The Reformation of the Dead* (Basingstoke, 2000).

[265] See Dürr, *Politische Kultur*.

[266] Kim Siebenhüner, "Glaubenswechsel in der Frühen Neuzeit," *Zeitschrift für Historische Forschung* 34 (2007), 243–72.

[267] C. Scott Dixon, "Urban Order and Religious Coexistence in the German Imperial City: Augsburg and Donauwörth, 1548–1608," *Central European History* 40 (2007), 1–33.

> past should be studied 'for its own sake'—as though a long dead age still had a 'sake.' Most students of the Reformation, however,…believed that the Protestant Reformation is one of the great central events of the history of our civilization, and that to understand it correctly is to come closer to understanding our own age.[268]

Contrast this view with a recent statement by Thomas Safley on the significance of studying Reformation-era poor relief:

> Charities…reflect the communities that create them. They express something of local culture and history; they are shaped by local social hierarchies and political relations; they are influenced by social tensions and ideological conflicts. They cannot, therefore, be completely understood in isolation or in general.…Normative statements and ideal types must be tested carefully against quotidian realities and local circumstances.… [D]oing so…recapture[s] the richness and humanity of early modern poor relief, the danger and desperation of its poverty as well as the calculation and generosity of its charity.…preserve[s] the dignity of the past, and…present[s] its significance in the present.[269]

These positions are not truly in conflict; Safley, like Brady, has displayed consistent, even overwhelming, commitment to responding to teleological claims. And "descriptive" research has significantly expanded our data on actual social circumstances, as well as circumventing the search for causes of present phenomena in the past as if those phenomena were foreordained. As a result of this work we have a much more exact idea of how the Lutheran Reformation spread into and affected local societies in the 16th and 17th centuries.

But the move from "presentist" interest in the Reformation to a priority on its significance in its own time is not without its problems. The localizing imperative of the "descriptive" approach has defused the master narratives about the Reformation, but it has not succeeded in eliminating the significance of grand questions as a means of moving the field forward and drawing broader interest in its results. A heavily non-presentist approach can lead to isolation and self-referentiality, a trend that has taken over the cautionary example of Renaissance history,[270] which, after disabling its grand narratives, has not produced new large questions in several generations. Harbingers

---

[268] Brady, "Social History," pp. 161–62.
[269] Thomas Max Safley, "Conclusion," in *Reformation of Charity*, pp. 193–99, p. 199.
[270] Christopher Celenza, *The Lost Italian Renaissance* (Baltimore, 2004).

of this problem are evident. Modern historians have responded to the tightening of research questions in Reformation studies by localizing debates over the emergence of modernity to their own period, so that very few early modernists participate in such discussions—as witnessed to by the failure of confessionalization research, the most important recent grand narrative about the Reformation, to become a mechanism for speaking across the early modern-modern divide. Even if Reformationists do not find such matters compelling, and prefer to sustain the current approach of employing cultural theories that eschew grand narratives, if the field is to maintain relevance within such scholarship, Reformation historians will need to begin to show how their studies in turn refertilize these theoretical formulations, with their own cultural or social-theoretical contributions.

No matter which approach we choose, social history research on Lutheranism obviously retains a great deal of power to speak to larger questions about modernity and human experience. This has never been more true than now, as consciousness of the historical and contemporary role of Christianity in the West grows. General interest in the social impact of the Reformation has not disappeared; the volume on Reformation in Fortress Press's *People's History of Christianity*, a general interest project explicitly framed "from below," has gone into a second printing in less than a year.[271] It will be the responsibility of the current generation of social-cultural historians to renew their attempts to speak to the broader questions of scholarly and general audiences, and to historical theologians, social data now at their disposal.

[271] *Reformation Christianity*, ed. Peter Matheson, *People's History of Christianity*, vol. 5 (Minneapolis, 2007).

CHURCH AND STATE IN LUTHERAN LANDS, 1550–1675

Robert von Friedeburg

Background

Introduction

Any understanding of the relationship of church and state must take into account very basic problems of terminology. Both terms (*ecclesia* and *res publica* being the most direct contemporary terms) bear a variety of contradictory meanings when used by people of the period. What is more, while it remains possible to use the term "church" as long as we keep in mind that the concepts of the spiritual, universal, and particular church were related, but not synonymous, the term "state" (*res publica*) harbors very significant problems. It was indeed known and employed—in terms of the legal person of the *universitas*, in its capacity of being endowed with jurisdiction and finance a *res publica*. But most terms pertaining to it remained part of the strategic resources employed mainly in legal and political discourse, used by the lawyers of competing groups of persons of the higher and middle nobility (from the emperor and princes to the imperial counts) but also by magistrates of imperial cities, abbeys, and monasteries, and others in order to claim independence from one another and competing jurisdictional and other rights. The political philosophy of commentators on Aristotle, e.g., Melanchthon, who made the term *res publica* common coinage, had little or no direct relation to the argument of lawyers who identified certain status groups or individuals with specific rights. Only by the very end of the 16th century were these rights beginning to be perceived as an outgrowth of what was increasingly addressed as a single right of territorial superiority, addressing power over something that was *not*, at this time, perceived to be a single closed legal entity. Around 1630 someone could still be geographically sitting within a territory without being part of it.[1] The term *ius territorii*, and the accompanying *superioritas*

[1] I thank Albrecht P. Luttenberger (Regensburg) for kind comments, suggestions, and

territoriale, was an invention about 1590 in the course of the reception of Jean Bodin and in conflicts about rights over the church. By the 1590s legal specialists at imperial courts claimed that it was generally accepted that whoever had *ius territorii* must also have the right to reform the institutions of the church covered by this right. Geographical location did not determine this issue alone, for still in the 1620s major scholars like Christoph Besold distinguished between "*in*" and "*de territorio*". Control over a parsonage that was part of, e.g., an abbey immediately responsible to the empire, geographically lying within the lands of another principality, was thus by no means a clear-cut issue.

With regard to the empire up to the later 17th century, we should not speak of 'state' or 'states', unless metaphorically, but of competing social-legal groups in various relations of allegiance to the emperor: of princes, counts, and other groups immediately responsible to the empire, for whom the acquisition of *ius territorii* by adequate interpretation of their own position became a strategic goal to improve their rights, and for whom the claim over the church became part and parcel of that strategic debate. While the term *ius territorii* began to become general legal coinage from 1600 on, most principalities, to say nothing of minor imperial estates, were not yet closed legal entities with any clear-cut monopolistic structure of supreme power that we often associate with the term 'state'. Even major principalities in the empire were, into the 16th century and indeed the 17th, constituted by personal legal relationships between prince and vassals and by a multitude of rights and legal claims. These included *Patronate* over the church, and control over assorted *Ämter* that together made up a principality.[2] "Church and state," as in "church and territory" or "*ius reformandi* and *ius territorii*" is thus only part of an objective past insofar as we can discover that it was part of a polemical and controversial debate among interested parties, in which late medieval legal and constitutional settings were slowly, but not entirely, transformed. To assess this debate one must take into account what was transformed. What we can describe with more clarity is what contemporaries thought of the relationship of

criticism of an earlier draft of this contribution. See Robert von Friedeburg, "Cuius regio eius religio. The ambivalent meanings of statebuilding in Protestant Germany, 1555–1655," in *Politics and Culture in Early Modern Central Europe*, eds. Howard Louthan et al. (New York, 2008).

[2] Dietmar Willoweit, *Grundlagen der Territorialgewalt* (Cologne, 1975); Christian Hesse, *Amtsträger der Fürsten im spätmittelalterlichen Reich* (Göttingen, 2005), p. 192.

the spiritual and universal church to the particular church, on the one hand, and of the relationship of that particular church to a wide range of civil magistrates, on the other hand. By no means all magistrates with interests in a given particular church did claim a *ius territorii*. The Alvensleben family in the area between Elbe and Aller, for example, could not and did not claim *ius territorii*, but they were nevertheless civil magistrates in their own right. They had significant *Patronatsrechte* and determined, in their lands, throughout this period the fate of the church and the placement of ministers in their villages. What follows therefore considers the relationship of the civil magistrate to the church and tries to keep in perspective that what counted was the interaction of various social and legal settings, of legal and theological debates, and of specific power struggles.

Unfortunately, the various bodies of sources reflecting these settings, debates, and struggles—and which inform us about the relationship of Lutheran churches to civil magistrates in the empire—bore terminologies virtually independent of or irreconcilable with each other. The legal and political terminology of two important documents outlining this relationship, the treaties of Passau and Augsburg (1552, 1555), had little if any relationship to Catholic or Lutheran definitions of church;[3] the sources later used by Lutheran clergy and jurists alike to understand and interpret the relationship of church and civil magistrate—among them medieval imperial law, Canon law, Roman law, Spanish and French ideas on the supremacy of the crown, and not least the theology of the Reformation[4]—were in themselves contradictory and ambiguous. Given this background, the relation of the Lutheran—particular—churches toward the civil magistrates, mainly princes and the magistrates of the free imperial cities, was determined by simultaneous and contradictory influences from specific circumstances, theological developments, imperial politics, the specifics of the distribution of *Patronatsrechte*, and the politics in each principality or town.

[3] See most recently Bernd Christian Schneider, *Ius Reformandi, die Entwicklung eines Staatskirchenrechts von seinen Anfängen bis zum Ende des Alten Reiches* (Tübingen, 2001), pp. 56–57.

[4] Martin Heckel, "Staat und Kirche nach den Lehren der evangelischen Juristen Deutschlands in der ersten Hälfte des 17. Jahrhunderts'," in: Part I *Zeitschrift für Rechtsgeschichte*, Kan. Abt. 73 (1956), 117–247, 74 (1957), 202–308, see 73, 126–28; 74, 210.

"Lutheran Thought" about the civil magistrate—the state of historiography

Lutheran thought concerning church and civil magistrate was characterized by two outstanding features. First, the political environment shaping it allowed commitment to Luther's devastating and uncompromising critique of the Church of Rome while preserving allegiance to a Catholic emperor and the legal setting of an empire still primarily Catholic. Appeals to the empire by Lutheran clergy and estates when resisting their own princely rulers significantly define their attitude toward these wayward princes. The context of the empire and its potential for support against princes is one of the major areas not sufficiently considered in much older research regarding the relation of church and civil magistrate in Lutheran Germany.[5] Second, particularly Luther developed an understanding of the civil order which emphasized functional needs rather then obedience *sui generis*. His emphasis was directed against the Church of Rome, persecution of his followers, and any conjunction of civil power and jurisdiction with issues of faith and church. Many of his statements were colored by apocalyptic anxieties, such as his 1539 statement concerning the three orders of magistrates, heads of households, and ministers.[6] Melanchthon wrote, not least as a commentator on Aristotle, from a more systematic civil perspective, for instance, on the office of magistrates. To what extent his emphasis in some writings on the all-encompassing role of civil magistrates differed from Luther's is a subject of debate.[7] The piece-meal and gradual introduction of material and organisational care for the church by Protestant magistrates in town and country during the 1520s to 1540s was guided by theologians' counsel but tended to result in practical care and control by civil magistrates. Sixteenth-century church orders did not yet spell out a consistent theory of the power of civil magistrates but introduced practices allowing civil magistrates considerable room for maneuver.[8]

---

[5] Ibid., 73, 124–25.

[6] Martin Brecht, *Martin Luther. Vol III: Die Erhaltung der Kirche 1532–1546* (Stuttgart, 1987), pp. 199–202.

[7] See, from different angles, in particular James Estes, *Peace, Order, and the Glory of God. Secular Authority and the Church in the Thought of Luther and Melanchthon* (1518–1559) (Leiden, 2005); John Witte, *Law and Protestantism. The Legal Teachings of the Lutheran Reformation* (Cambridge, 2002).

[8] Martin Honecker, *Cura Religionis Magistratus Christiani. Studien zum Kirchenrecht im Luthertum insbesondere bei Johann Gerhard* (Munich, 1968), pp. 30–32; on Luther and the approach on "Two Regiments," see Martin Brecht, *Martin Luther. Vol II: Ordnung und Abgrenzung der Reformation 1521–1532* (Stuttgart, 1986), pp. 118–22.

But as Roland Bainton, among others, reminded us, Luther stated in his 1523 *On Civil Authority* that belief is a "free work" (*freies Werk um den Glauben*) that should not be enforced, and that civil magistrates should let subjects believe as they "can and will" (*so oder so glauben lassen, wie man kann und will*). Indeed, the *limits* of what civil magistrates could and should enforce are the chief point of this very treatise.[9]

Until the 1980s, historiography presumed, based especially on the groundbreaking works of Martin Heckel and Martin Honecker,[10] that these premises were fundamentally transformed during the later 16th and 17th centuries. Luther's own rejection of any use of force in issues of faith[11] and the rather residual role he saw in the *Kirchenordnungen* as *Adiaphora* rested on his own understanding of the church, while the Lutheran understanding of the relationship of church and civil magistrate was to be defined by the classical '*polis*' church, the church defined by and through a given *civitas*. In practice these mutually irreconcilable senses of the meaning of church[12] did begin to become entwined through the interplay of three factors. The distinction among the spiritual, universal, and particular church, and later visible and invisible church, eventually allowed for the establishment of a special place for magistrates in the particular visible church without directly compromising Luther's approach to the spiritual and universal church. The constitution of the visible particular church was ordered along the three-estate-theory, eventually giving prominence to the estate of

---

[9] Roland Bainton, *Martin Luther*, ed. Bernhard Lohse (Göttingen, 1980), p. 212; see Martin Luther, *Von weltlicher Obrigkeit, wie weit man ihr Gehorsam schuldig sei*, WA 11:245–81; here Martin Luther, *Ausgewählte Schriften*, ed. Karin Bornkamm, Gerhard Ebeling, IV (Frankfurt/M, 1982), pp. 36–84, 63, 38–39. See Brecht, *Luther* 2:121: "In ihrer Wirkungsgeschichte waren diese Gedanken [*Von Weltlicher Obrigkeit*] ein wichtiger Beitrag zur Gewissensfreiheit".

[10] Heckel, "Staat und Kirche," Honecker, *Cura Religionis*.

[11] Ibid., p. 13, regarding WA 15:210–21.

[12] Of course, Lutheran Orthodoxy faced fundamental critique much earlier, as the struggle over the true legacy of Luther divided Protestant theologians immediately after his death in 1546. The subsequent doctrinal debates called into question what actually Lutheran Orthodoxy was. At least from the time of Thomasius, however, eighteenth-century philosophers and theologians attacked "Lutheran Orthodoxy" as the narrow and unworthy follower of the Great Man, allegedly subject to the princely state, and as a betrayer of the idea of a spiritual church and of true Christian Freedom. Despite all subsequent changes of opinion, see Ernst Troeltsch, *Vernunft und Offenbarung bei Gerhard und Melanchthon* (Göttingen, 1891), pp. 206–07. For the beginning of the revision, see Jörg Baur, *Lutherisches Christentum im konfessionellen Zeitalter—ein Vorschlag zur Orientierung und Verständigung*, in *Religion und Religiosität im Zeitalter des Barock*, ed. Dieter Breuer et al. (Wiesbaden, 1995), 1:43–62.

magistrates. For the visible particular church the princely *pater patriae* thus achieved decisive influence[13] and played a dominant legal, political, and economic role. From the 1520s on, as owner of the princely demesne and thus as the major lord of peasants and urban subjects, as holder of a significant share of the *Kirchenpatronat* in many villages and towns, and as occupant of the strategically vital office of magistrate immediately responsible to the emperor, the prince could take responsibility for taking care for the practical aspects of the Reformation. The resulting comprehensive allocation of responsibilities combined eventually to submit the church to the care of the civil magistrate, reenforced by the notion of Christian *Policey* in German lands. Eventually, while civil magistrates would help enforce compliance with Lutheran Orthodoxy and thus enforce pressure in the realm of faith, the pulpit served to inform civil powers what the 'well-ordered state' should be. With examples taken from the Constantine or Justinian, with the motivation of a comprehensive ordering of society by Christian *Policey*, the church, entirely contrary to what Luther had argued, became almost an agency of the "state".[14]

More recently, however, chiefly during the last two decades, qualifications to this general argument have been raised. This paper seeks to find a balance between the older, still important, insights of Heckel and Honecker and more recent research. Qualifications have come from different corners. The punishment of crime and the admonition of sins were found to have remained distinct;[15] it was shown that Lutheran clergy and estates also successfully defended the faith against their own lords and princes,[16] making arguments for resisting them as well as the Catholic emperor and their Catholic princely neighbors;[17]

---

[13] Honecker, *Cura Religionis*, p. 135.

[14] The current locus classicus in English-speaking scholarship is probably still Marc Raeff's *Well Ordered Police State* (New Haven, 1983); see most recently Helga Schnabel-Schüle, *Überwachen und Strafen im Territorialstaat: Bedingungen und Auswirkungen des Systems strafrechtlicher Sanktionen im frühneuzeitlichen Württemberg* (Cologne, 1997).

[15] Martin Brecht, "Protestantische Kirchenzucht zwischen Kirche und Staat. Bemerkungen zur Forschungssituation," in *Kirchenzucht und Sozialdisziplinierung im frühneuzeitlichen Europa*, ed. Heinz Schilling (Berlin, 1994), pp. 41–48.

[16] See for instance Heinz Schilling, *Konfessionskonflikt und Staatsbildung. Eine Fallstudie über das Verhältnis von religiösem und sozialem Wandel in der Frühneuzeit am Beispiel der Grafschaft Lippe* (Gütersloh, 1981); Bodo Nischan, *Prince, People, and Confession: the Second Reformation in Brandenburg* (Philadelphia, 1994).

[17] Robert von Friedeburg, *Self defense and religious strife in Early Modern Europe. England and Germany 1530 to 1680* (Aldershot, 2002); Arno Strohmeyer, *Konfessionskonflikt und Herrschaftsordnung. Widerstandsrecht bei den österreichischen Ständen (1550–1650)* (Mainz, 2006);

that not only the realization but the composition of the formula '*cuius regio-eius religio*' was significantly more piecemeal and varied than thought earlier;[18] that Lutheran confessional culture was not only diverse and differentiated, but that internal divisions over fundamental issues of doctrine make it problematic to speak without qualifications of Lutheranism as an entity, a single "*kirchlich-theologische Grösse*;"[19] that particularly Lutheran ministers, not least at princely courts and in towns, did voice open and massive critique against princely measures;[20] that the actual distribution of legal privileges and economic might between prince and estates, from *Patronatsrechten* in noble hands to the extent of noble manors, could decisively influence the relationship of Lutheran church and princely power;[21] that Lutheran jurists did develop, at least into the 1620s, quite radical interpretations of Luther's demand for freedom of conscience for subjects.[22]

This variety of re-interpretation and change in emphasis is accompanied by a broader questioning of the judgments delivered by Troeltsch and others during the 1910s and 1920s in debates significantly shaped

---

Robert von Friedeburg, "Bausteine widerstandsrechtlicher Argumente in der frühen Neuzeit (1523–1668): Konfessionen, klassische Verfassungsvorbilder, Naturrecht, direkter Befehl Gottes, Historische Rechte der Gemeinwesen," in *Recht und Konfession in der frühen Neuzeit*, eds. Hans Christoph Strohm and Johann De Wall (Berlin, 2008).

[18] Schneider, *Ius Reformandi*.

[19] Thomas Kaufmann, *Dreissigjähriger Krieg und Westfälischer Friede. Kirchengeschichtliche Studien zur lutherischen Konfessionskultur* (Tübingen 1998); Irene Dingel, *Concordia Controversia. Die öffentlichen Diskussionen um das lutherische Konkordienwerk am Ende des 16. Jahrhunderts* (Gütersloh, 1996); Thomas Kaufmann, "Die Anfänge der Theologischen Fakultät Jena im Kontext der innerlutherischen Kontroversen zwischen 1548–1561," in *John Frederick I—der lutherische Kurfürst*, eds. Volker Leppin et al. (Gütersloh, 2006), pp. 209–58, 215.

[20] Robert Kolb, "Matthaeus Judex's Condemnation of Princely Censorship of Theologian's Publications," *CH* 50 (1981), 401–14; see also the contributions to this issue in *Debatten über die Legitimität von Herrschaft*, eds. Luise Schorn-Schütte and Sven Tode (Berlin, 2006)*;* Wolfgang Sommer, *Politik, Theologie und Frömmigkeit im Luthertum der frühen Neuzeit* (Göttingen, 1999); idem, Die *lutherischen Hofprediger in Dresden* (Stuttgart, 2006). A summary on the Lutheran *Politica* can be found in Robert von Friedeburg, Michael Seidler, 'The Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation," in: Howell Lloyd et al. (eds.), *European Political Thought 1450–1700*, (New Haven, 2007) 102–175, 129–133.

[21] See e.g. Peter Michael Hahn, *Adlige Herrschaft zwischen Fürstliche Territorialhoheit und lokale Adelsgewalt: die herrschaftliche Durchdringung des ländlichen Raumes zwischen Elbe und Aller (1300–1700)* (Berlin, 1989). To the end of the 17th century the Berlin consistory had not much to say in the lands of the Alvensleben!

[22] Robert von Friedeburg, "Cuius regio," passim; Friedeburg, Seidler, "Holy Roman Empire", 146–148. Special note must be made of Horst Dreitzel, who in several publications demarcated the genre of the Christliche Policey as distinguished from other genres of reflection on the res publica.

by contemporary concerns.[23] The last thirty years and the variety of research by historians and ecclesiastical historians such as Jörg Baur, Walter Sparn, Martin Brecht, Horst Dreitzel and Luise Schorn-Schütte have undermined the interpretative structure according to which an authoritarian Lutheran state church unconditionally serving the prince provided the major entry. We should not now fall into the opposite error and address the Lutheran churches in the empire as democratic or as examples of 'communalism,' as has been done for the Counter-Reformation Catholic Church in southwest Germany. Rather, a cautious balance of older knowledge and more recent findings is in order.

Conceptual background: Luther and Melanchthon

Of Luther's three main publications of 1520, *An den Christlichen Adel Deutscher Nation* consciously placed itself in the tradition of the grievances of the German Nation against Rome. Its denial of papal power over secular magistrates and of papal authority to interpret scripture[24] echoed the concerns of contemporary princes and earlier demands, e.g. by the dukes of Bavaria and Archduke Ferdinand, to amend alleged failures of the ecclesiastical jurisdiction in their lands.[25] The papacy had fought fifteenth-entury conciliarism with concordats and had thus itself paved the way for such claims. None of this, though, translated into a pre-reformation *Kirchenregiment*,[26] for the Church of Rome had retained its general claim to administration and jurisdiction in its own affairs.

Luther's advice concerning the duties of civil magistrates to conduct reform and on the nature of civil authority rested on his vision of the relationship of God and sinner and the subsequent nature of

[23] *Alteuropa oder Frühe Moderne: Deutungsmuster für das 16. bis 18. Jahrhundert aus dem Krisenbewußtsein der Weimarer Republik in Theologie, Rechts- und Geschichtswissenschaft*, ed. Luise Schorn Schütte (Berlin, 1999). For the basis of many of Troeltsch' later statements, see his *Vernunft und Offenbarung*, esp. pp. 206–13.

[24] Clemin (1950) pp. 362–425, or WA 6:404–69. See Brecht, *Martin Luther. Vol. I.: Sein Weg zur Reformation 1483–1521*, (Stuttgart, 1981), pp. 352–61.

[25] Heinz Angermeier, *Reichsreform und Reformation* (Oldenbourg, 1983), pp. 15–17, examples of Archduke Ferdinand, taxing clerics, and the Bavarian dukes, jurisdiction of clerics in issues of criminal justice.

[26] Schneider, *Ius Reformandi*; Martin Heckel, *Deutschland im konfessionellen Zeitalter* (Göttingen, 1983); idem, "Ius reformandi. Auf dem Wege zum 'Modernen' Staatskirchenrecht im Konfessionellen Zeitalter," in *Reformation und Recht. Festgabe für Gottfried Seebass zum 65. Geburtstag*, eds. Irene Dingel et al. (Gütersloh, 2002), pp. 75–126.

the spiritual, universal,and particular church.[27] Saving grace remained entirely in the hands of a rationally incomprehensible God as Lord over fallen men. The spiritual church was Christ's mystical body, the community of true believers; the universal church the community of those baptised, the field to be worked by preaching the gospel; the particular church the church in each polity, bound together by the community of those receiving the sacraments and the gospel. Where God's word was spoken, there was God. For allowing the seeds of faith to grow, men could not do without the universal and the particular church, providing the gospel and sacraments. Individual inspiration (against Müntzer and the Anabaptists) or any mixture of civil and ecclesiastical offices violated this nature of the church. This approach defined the place of civil government, and thus reflections on politics, unhelpfully summarized now as the "*Zwei Reiche Lehre*". Like other sketches of society, but fuelled by apocalyptic anxiety of the papal Beerwolf, Luther's 1539 circular disputation on Mathew 19:21 alleged that God had instituted three estates to maintain his order set in the world.[28] They differed not primarily hierarchically but rather functionally with respect to their offices, i.e. preaching the gospel (*Lehrstand*, the clergy), producing this life's necessities (*Nehrstand*, the family) and administrating justice and keeping the peace (*Wehrstand*, the magistrates). Described as functionally dependent on one another, this approach did not primarily address the civil order as divided into magistrates and subjects, but addressed the duties of Christians toward each other in the civil commonwealth. Luther consequently urged every Christian, including the *Nehrstand*, to take the sword against an extraordinary threat to God's order from the *belua bestia* (2 Thes. 2:3–10), represented by the Popish antichrist.[29]

---

[27] Issues such as his own development, and changes, such as 1517 and 1521, are not treated here.

[28] *Zirkulardisputation* on Matthew (1539), WA 39,2:34–91. Latin 39–44, "Tres enim hierarchias," German pp. 48–49: "geistlich," "weltlich," "häuslich". See his lectures on Genesis, 1535–45, WA 44:19, 440–441; Luise Schorn Schütte, "Die Drei Stände Lehre im reformatorischen Umbruch," in *Die frühe Reformation in Deutschland als Umbruch*, ed. Bernd Moeller (Gütersloh, 1997), pp. 435–61. See also her "Politische Kommunikation in der frühen Neuzeit: Obrigkeitskritik im Alten Reich," in *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 32 (2006), 273–314, where she points out earlier statements from Justus Menius from 1528 on the "Hausstand" as an estate on its own, p. 305.

[29] Luther's 1530 interpretation of Psalm 82 emphasizes the vital role of keeping the peace and 1 Tim 1–2; see Martin Brecht, *Reformation: Aufgewählte Aufsätze* (Stuttgart, 1995).

For Luther, magistrates thus had responsibilities for the church as all Christians had, enhanced, in accord with their responsibility as governors, by the power given to them by God within the civil order. They had no role in directing the church. *An den Christlichen Adel* attacked in fundamental terms the secular power of the papacy, argued the common priesthood of all believers,[30] and proposed reforms of the church to be carried out by civil magistrates in the face of failure by and corruption in Rome. Over time and as problems posed themselves, he further developed his approach on the nature of the civil magistracy, particularly in his 1523 *Von Weltlicher Oberheit*, against Catholic estates acting against the Reformation, and his 1525 *Wider die himmlischen Propheten* against the spiritualists. Probably from the 1530s, Luther had accepted a general reformation in the entire empire would not take place; he then worried primarly about peace in the empire and securing the reform of particular churches where it could be achieved. Against this background the Lutheran Reformation insisted on the independence of the church from civil magistrates *and* the inviolability of civil laws (*evangelium non tollit leges*). He condemned spreading the Reformation through attacks on Catholic princes[31] or disobedience to those in authority (apart from passive disobedience) for religious reasons, as he advised Elector Frederick in 1522/23. As Christians and magistrates, princes had to, like everyone else, obey the powers set above them, including the emperor,[32] and to bow to spiritual admonition.[33] This led into an account of the *cura religionis* of the estates of the empire, whether princes or urban magistrates, as magistrates and as members of God's people.[34] Toward the community of the particular church at hand, this approach fed into a comprehensive reform of Christian life, to be carried out by magistrates as Christians, advised and admonished by Lutheran theologians, starting with a reform of clergy and church, but involving the founding of universities, hospitals, foundations for the

[30] WA 6:404–469, with the responsibilities of secular magistrates for the church following from their belonging to the "geystlichs standes".

[31] I thank Gottfried Seebass for comments particularly on Luther's interpretation of Psalm 82 (1530).

[32] Heckel, "Ius reformandi," in *Reformation und Recht*, pp. 75–126.

[33] Later interpretations, systematized into the "Zwei Reiche Lehre," should be carefully distinguished from the actual argument of the 1520s to 1540s. The term "Reich" first only entered in popular sermons.

[34] Heckel, "Ius reformandi," Schneider, *Ius Reformandi*. In legal practice, that built on the estates' rights over the church via *Vogtei* and *Patronat*.

poor, provisions for the education of those of lesser means, and moral reform in the broadest of terms.[35]

Melanchthon also acted as interpreter of Aristotle and Cicero.[36] The distinction between gospel and law, justification by faith alone, and justice in civil issues (*evangelium non tollit leges*) allowed him to carve out a place for ethics[37] and to reintroduce, alongside interpretations of Aristotle and Cicero, political thought *sui generis* into his reflection on the *ordo politicus*. Changes in detail, including the increasing use of the term *ordo* (*politicus*)[38] or his distinction of *vindicta* and *defensio*[39] have to be considered in terms of his general outlook.[40] The law of nature became his conceptual starting point.[41] Melanchthon attempted to spell out the law of nature with a variety of basic precepts.[42] In particular, his *Philosophiae moralis epitome* (1538) and his comments on Cicero's *De Officiis* (1562) include explications on the law of nature. Melanchthon did not only refer to Augustine or Thomas, but also to the scholastic theologian Petrus de Palude,[43] and primarily to Plato, Cicero and Stoic assumptions about common principles of reason, planted by God in men.[44] The contents of the law of nature consisted of these implanted ideas.[45] While the Fall had made these precepts less clear to humans,

[35] See Martin Heckel, "Rechtstheologie Luthers," in *Evangelisches Staatslexikon* (Berlin, 1975), cols. 2052–83.

[36] *Politische Korrespondenz des Herzogs und Kurfürsten Moritz von Sachsen: vol 5: 9. Januar 1551–1. Mai 1552*, ed. Günter Wartenberg (Berlin, 1998); Nicole Kuropka, *Philipp Melanchthon: Wissenschaft und Gesellschaft: ein Gelehrter im Dienst der Kirche (1526–1532)* (Tübingen, 2002).

[37] Wolfgang Matz, *Der befreite Mensch: die Willenslehre in der Theologie Philipp Melanchthons* (Göttingen, 2001); Werner Elert, "Societas bei Melanchthon" *Das Erbe Luthers*, ed. Robert Felke (Leipzig, 1928), p. 35.

[38] Rolf Bernard Huschke, *Melanchthons Lehre vom Ordo politicus: ein Beitrag zum Verhältnis von Glauben und politischen Handeln bei Melanchthon* (Gütersloh, 1968).

[39] Melanchthon, *Loci Theologici* (1543), CR 21:702–23: "Paterfamilias debet defensionem suae coniugi et suis liberis, ergo in oppugnatione aedium facit officium dilectionis".

[40] Timothy J. Wengert, *Philip Melanchthon (1497–1560) and the Commentary* (Sheffield, 1997), pp. 57–76.

[41] Emilio Bonfatti, *Politische Begriffe und historisches Umfeld in der „Politica methodice digesta" des Johannes Althusius* (Wiesbaden, 2002), pp 317–18.

[42] For example *Capita* (1520), CR 21:23–28; *Loci Communes* (1521), CR 1:366; *Enarratio Libri V Ethicorum Aristoteles*, III, CR 16:389.

[43] Ibid., cols. 699, 701.

[44] *Notitiae*. See also *Enarratio libri V Ethicorum Aristoteles*, CR 16: 389: Mens humana est imago Dei: erga in ea oportet lucere agnitionem Dei, et conventiam voluntatis.

[45] "Notitia Dei et discrimen honestorum et turpium". *Ennaratio libri ethicorum Aristotelis* (1529), CR 16:279, see Christoph Strohm, "Zugänge zum Naturrecht bei Melanchthon," in *Der Theologe Melanchthon*, ed. (Stuttgart, 2000), pp 339–56, pp. 341–43.

their knowledge remained accessible. *Honestum* and *turpe* could still be distinguished.[46] While Melanchthon had originally understood magistrates to be instituted after the Fall,[47] both in the 1532 *Commentarii in Librum Polit. Aristotelis*. and *Loci Theologici* (1559), he described them as being directly part of natural law and, in the *Loci* of 1543/1559, endowed with *dignitas rerum politicarum*.[48] Melanchthon's central terms to describe the civil order were *magistratus, societas*, and *res publica*. Society needed tools (*vincula*) to work, defined as *imperia, leges, iustitiae*, but also *doctrina virtutum*.[49] Implementation lay with the office of magistrates. Christians had the duty to care for and support society.[50] The magistrate's *potestas civilis* proceeded directly from the needs of the *societas civilis* and was as an office ordained by God.[51] Since magistrates needed to order society, subjects had to obey.[52] During the 1550s Melanchthon addressed this configuration of men able to understand the law of nature, its relation to the civil laws, the function of magistrates in ordering society, and the need for subjects to obey as "*ordo politicus*," the part of divine creation addressing civil society and its organization.[53] Melanchthon thus emphasized the legitimacy of magistrates as divinely instituted, indeed, as Luther had done, and it has been rightly concluded that the two should not be played off against each other.[54] However, in accordance with the relevant imperial *Policeyordnungen*, Melanchthon subsumed the prosecution of blasphemy, understood in a very broad way, under the responsibilities of civil magistrates. Also, Melanchthon saw jurisdiction

---

[46] Emilio Bonfatti, *Politische Begriffe des Johannes Althusius*, pp. 317–18.

[47] CR 21: 23–28; 21:118; 21:227–30; See Isabelle Delfers, *Lex und Ordo. Eine rechtshistorische Untersuchung der Rechtsauffassung Melanchthons* (Berlin, 2005), 34.

[48] CR 16: 388, 436–38, 442: politia, being part of creation, is understood as "legitima ordinatio civitatis, secundum quam alii praesunt, alii parent". Governing magistrates (i.e. alii praesunt), however, are bound to divine law, the law of nature and the laws of the given commonwealth and can be hold accountable to them, see Robert von Friedeburg, "'Officium in rempublicam': Fürstliche Herrschaft und Territorialstaat in politischen und rechtlichen Reflektionen und Projektionen im Jahrhundert der Reformation," in *Politik und Religion. Eigenlogik oder Verzahnung?*, eds. Robert von Friedeburg and Luise Schorn-Schütte (Munich, 2007), 33–70, 60–63 on the *Loci Communes* of 1543/1559. Quotation from CR 21: 924.

[49] See Elert, "Societas;" CR 11: 916–24, see col. 919.

[50] "Civilem societatem colere et adiuvare," CR 11:260; CR 16: 433; Elert, "Societas". Thus, "Civitas est societas civium iure constituta, propter mutuam defensionem," while "Politica est ordinatio civitatis, secundum alii praesunt, alii parent," CR 16:435–36.

[51] Elert, "Societas," CR 3: 466–72.

[52] Huschke, *Melanchthons Lehre*, pp. 114–19.

[53] Ibid.

[54] See Estes, *Peace, Order, and the Glory of God.*

in marital matters firmly in the hands of civil magistrates. To his mind, it had belonged to episcopal jurisdiction only as part of the civil jurisdiction of bishops because it had been originally (and according to the Justinian Code) part of the civil magistrates' jurisdictional realm anyway. Two factors—the growing place of the law of nature as Melanchthon's conceptual tool and overarching category of analysis and description, and his insistence on the magistrates' place as chief executor of its laws and their translation into positive law—have led historians to claim that his statements mark a phase in the development of natural law as the core legitimizing category for the civil order.[55] They also stress that Melanchthon's emphasis promoted a strong role for civil magistrates in church matters, not least in conjunction with the responsibility of civil magistates for "*christliche Policey*" in its very broad contemporary meaning. In his 1543/1559 *Loci theologici* the church as visible assembly of believers is divided into teachers and pupils. Civil magistrates are only obliged to "improve" it (*emendatio ecclesiasticarum*),[56] and Melanchthon repeatedly emphasized the freedom of conscience from suppression. But the civil magistrate's office as *custos primae et secundae tabulae legis* paves the way for the strong position of princes and urban magistrate described as *landesherrliches Kirchenregiment.* While later theologians dealing with the issue of the place of civil magistrates such as Martin Chemnitz would follow Melanchthon without much qualification, the issue to what extent differences in emphasis should be seen between Luther and Melanchthon remains a matter of debate.[57]

Melanchthon gave also significant place to ethics as providing rules for a good life in the civil commonwealth. Teaching ethics was even more efficient than punishing according to law, for it had a stronger impact on people. Melanchthon placed ethics into his teaching without compromising the Lutheran denial of the saving efficacy of good works and insistence on salvation by grace alone. He did so by using the distinction of grace and civil justice with respect to his account of the human will.[58] According to his "Fragmenta Locorum communium" (1533), with regard to external civic works (*opera externa civila*) man could

[55] Deflers, *Lex und Ordo*, pp. 219, 246–47, 273.

[56] CR 21:1013. See Martin Brecht, "Melanchthon's Ekklesiologische Reden", in: *Humanismus und Wittenberger Reformation*, ed. Michael Beyer, Günter Wartenberg (Leipzig 1996), 297–312, on Melanchthon's describing the church similar to a university.

[57] See Honecker, *Cura Religionis*, pp. 161–62; and with a different emphasis, Estes, *Peace, Order, and the Glory of God.*

[58] Günter Frank, "The Reason of Acting: Melanchthon's Concept of Practical Philosophy and the Question of the Unity and Consistency of His Philosophy," in *Moral*

act out of his own free will (*libertas voluntatis*).[59] Still, acting *upon* this will, passions compromised the ability to actually do what the *intellectus* had identified as the will's goal. Thus, the *dictamen rectae rationis* itself was neither a self-sufficient basis for distinguishing good from evil, nor was the will entirely capable of choosing to do what had been identified as good.[60] But Melanchthon followed Aristotle in arguing that passions could have, if appropriately shaped, a positive influence on the human mind and carry it to virtuous actions.[61] It is against this background that Melanchthon, in 1538, reiterated in a letter to Count Schlick, published as part of the preface to an edition of Tacitus' *Germania*, that love of fatherland was inscribed on the human heart by God to instigate defense of religion and the laws of their fatherland and that "fatherland" had to be understood as the community enforcing true doctrine and just laws.[62] *Amor*, Melanchthon held, was thus a passion not only capable of influencing and directing the human will (as unfortunately other passions were, too) but of doing that in ways and for causes pleasing to God.[63] Similarly, the desire to know about the antiquities of the fatherland (*cupiditas cognoscendi antiquitatem patriae*) was also regarded a passion strengthening our love for fatherland and thus our will to defend it. Melanchthon thus encouraged the reading of books that tell us about the history of the fatherland and provide examples for virtuous behavior (*ad virtutem exempla*). These examples would stir love of fatherland, which in turn would influence the will, rendering people unwilling to endure servitude, making them hostile to

Philosophy on the Threshold of Modernity, ed. J. Kraye and Risto Saarinen (Dordrecht, 2005), pp. 217–33.

[59] CR 21:276–80; Matz, *Der befreite Mensch*, pp. 116–17.

[60] CR 21:270–74; Matz, *Befreite Mensch*, pp. 136.

[61] CR 16:21–164, here col 51–52: "Alii [affectus] cum ratione consentiunt, ut amor coniugium, liberorum, benevolentia erga bene meritos, misericordia erga calamitosos, irasci his qui inferunt iniuriam. Hi affectus boni…erantque futuri in natura hominis, etiamsi non fuisset corrupta vitio originis. Et hi affectus sunt impetus ad virtutem…" cf. Frank, "Reason".

[62] CR 3:565–67: Divinitus omnium hominum pectoribus mirificus quidam patriae amor insitus est, credo, ut extimularetur ad defensionem illarum maximarum rerum, quas patria continet, religionis, legum disciplinae, imo vero ut admoneremur, etiam illam coelestem sedem, unde animorum origo est, amandam et appetendam esse. Nemo igitur tam ferreo est animo, quem non cupiditas aliqua teneat, cognoscendi antiquitatem patriae et quasi picturam veteram, sicut videre iuvat illa tecta, quae nascentes primum exceperunt. Also in that same year Melanchthon finished his *Philosophiae moralis epitome*, where his integration of philosophy into the new theology was largely complete.

[63] Karl-Heinz zur Mühlen, *Reformation und Gegenreformation; Zugänge zur Kirchengeschichte* (Göttingen, 1999), pp. 327–36.

cruelty and tyranny.[64] Whether love of *patria* would exclusively serve the princely *pater patriae*, as, for example, in Denmark, or also the Lutheran *patria* itself, was going to become dependent on the circumstances.

Reform with magistrates since the 1520s

After 1526 civil magistrates in town and country did erect a "practical" *Kirchenregiment*.[65] Its actual meaning and functioning, however, remained open to interpretation and conflict in the years to come. The 1526 compromise of the imperial estates allowed Luther's adherents to tolerate or help to organize reform the church. Assemblies of estates, clergy, and prince (as in Hesse), *Religionsgespräche* (in many towns), visitations (e.g., in electoral Saxony), and the gradual development of evangelical consistories, based not least on Justus Jonas "Bedencken der Consistorien halben" for electoral Saxony, formed the basis of this development.[66] Already earlier, the example of Zurich, where Zwingli and the councillors had begun the reformation of the church in1523, had made an impact on upper German imperial towns. In Nuremberg the peasant war served as the last external event to encourage the councillors to go forward with reforming the church. Electoral Saxony under Elector John the Constant remains the chief example of the ensuing territorial reformation. Pursued "under the eyes and with the consent of Luther,"[67] it demonstrated how to combine his own 1523 emphasis on the strict separation of church and civil jurisdiction with the recruitment of civil princely power for the reform of the church. Luther's famous preface to the 1528 Saxon *Instructions for Visitors* and other statements described the Christian prince's obligations as emergency measures in the face of acutely failing episcopal jurisdiction. Indeed, all measures remained based on theological advice, including the *Kirchenordnungen*. Of course, this new responsibility, different from but nevertheless also rooted in the 15th-century examples of individual princely interferences with the church mentioned above, together with *Patronatsrechten*, was able to

[64] CR 3:566–67: "Servitutis impatiens, inimica crudelitati, libidinibus, tyrannidi". Robert von Friedeburg, "The Office of the Patriot: The Problems of Passions and of Love of Fatherland in Protestant Thought, Melanchthon to Althusius, 1520s to 1620s," in *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History*, III Series, 3 (2006), pp. 241–73.

[65] Honecker, *Cura Religionis*, pp. 25–31.

[66] Ibid., pp. 23–26; the best introduction remains Horst Rabe, *Reich und Glaubensspaltung. Deutschland 1500–1600* (Frankfurt/M, 1989) pp. 237–46.

[67] Ibid., p. 238.

establish a very substantial influence over the church. Most recently, Siegrid Westphal has closely scrutinized the facts regarding the emergence of a *Landesherrliche Kirchenregiment* in Saxony. John the Constant, brother and successor of Frederick the Wise, was indeed a major driving force in shaping the reform of the church after 1525, but, as elsewhere, he did so not only in close contact with advising theologians, but also on initiative of the territorial estates. Indeed, John Frederick, John's son, made suggestions from 1524 on, that became part of the basis of the instruction for the electoral visitation; they can be understood as a summary and as follow-up to demands from the knights and estates. As elsewhere, the mood of the day favored comprehensive reform of Christian morals, *Policey*. John, deeply indebted to his estates and in need of further financial resources in order to pay for his military politics within the Smalcald League, cooperated with these estates in pursuing Christian *Policey* and reform of the church.[68]

The 1527 instruction based itself entirely on the Lutheran concept of grace, the priesthood of all believers, and the gratitude of prince and people to God. Luther's preface to Melanchthon's 1528 *Unterricht für die Visitatoren* stressed the corruption of the papal church. The group actually requesting further reform was the territorial estates. They possessed *Patronatsrechte* and thus faced in any case the issue of whom to place as minister in their parishes. They were concerned with issues of local order and preaching. They addressed the problems of the papal church as "*Landesgebrechen*".[69] The estates demanded in particular a more stringent address of a wide range of issues which they thought were not well covered by the *Landesordnung* of 1482. They thus demanded new and more coherent *Policey* and *Landesordnungen* to deal with the problems as they saw them before granting the money the prince needed so urgently. While there were internal divisions during the early Reformation between the prelates trying to quash the Reformation and the knights supporting reforming ministers, what proved decisive were, for instance, the knights' demands to appoint, in each *Amt* (the smallest, most cohesive administrative unit; mostly a few villages and a small town) a nobleman or judicial magistrate from the prince (*Amtmann*) to supervise the clergy and particularly the correctness of its

[68] Siegrid Westphal, "Die Ausgestaltung des Kirchenwesens unter John Frederick—Ein landesherrliches Kirchenregiment," in *Johann Frederick I.*, pp. 261–81, esp. 263, 269.

[69] Quoted as in ibid., pp. 268–69: a formulation used in the protocols of the estate assemblies.

teaching. Resources of the church were to be reallocated to provide for the poor and needy.[70] After the death of Frederick the Wise, John had these and other suggestions summarized in a single list. Beyond the estates' original suggestions, worship services were to be conducted in accordance with Luther's *Deutsche Messe*. Westphal concludes that against this background the demands for a visitation formulated by John Frederick and Luther after 1524/1525 mainly re-iterate what had earlier been demanded by the estates.[71] When in 1530 Elector John had to ask his estates again for financial support for both *Türkenhilfe* and military engagement within the emerging Smalcald League, the knights picked up an earlier suggestion from John to the emperor. In order to deescalate the mounting confrontation over the property of the church in the lands of reforming princes, John had suggested to Charles that an independent administrative body administer the property of the Church of Rome in his lands for a transitional period "*sequester weisse*" until some solution was reached. Charles refused to accept this suggestion. But the idea of sequestration was adopted by the territorial estates although it had not found legal support on the imperial level.[72] They wanted to keep a firm grip on the financial resources of the prince and possibly of the church for their own advantage. A special committee established an agreement between John Frederick, negotiating on behalf of his father (possibly due to his father's ill-health), and the estates about the manner of sequestration in 1531. In the future the estates allowed income from this property to be transferred to the prince in order to pay for his expenses, not least within the Smalcald League. A committee of the estates took over control of princely debts. Only in 1543 was John Frederick, now himself Elector, able to pressure the estates into handing over the incomes from sequestered goods into direct princely administration. To a degree, demands for a broader engagement of civil magistates with the enforcement of *Christliche Policey*, and even control of the church, were a means for the estates to justify their own entanglement with the administration of sequestered property. When in 1535 the visitation strongly deplored the lack of authority of the "new church" in Saxony, its lack of discipline, and the appalling way in which broad sections of the people tried to exploit their alleged new

[70] Ibid., p. 268.
[71] Ibid., p. 269.
[72] Ibid., p. 270.

freedom, demands for the appointment of new judges and new ways to enforce compliance reached John Frederick.[73]

There is no point in generalizing specific developments in electoral Saxony, but, for instance, developments in Hesse[74] appear to be not entirely dissimilar. The point is plain. Economic bankcruptcy and political decline may very well remain an important characteristic of many territorial estates in the empire during the 17th century. But during the 16th, while massive indebtedness as in Saxony or Brandenburg was not the case everywhere (not in Hesse, e.g.), broad participation of the estates in enforcing order and surveying finances was rather the rule than the exception. As local and regional disorder, estrangement of churchlands, lack of adequate ministers, and related problems remained during the first decades of the Reformation, estates demanded that reform must be implemented. The variety of civil incursions into ecclesiastical issues that had been happening by 1552 should not be seen entirely as benefitting a proto-absolutist government of princes, but rather a complex interplay of princely responsibilities, estates pressures and concerns, and the real need to re-order the material well-being of the church in town and countryside.

Passau and Augsburg

Passau

The compromise negotiated between King Ferdinand and the new Saxon elector Moritz—that Charles did *not* accept and that thus did *not* become the actual treaty of Passau—remains an important document, an important tool on which to base *later* interpretations of the nature of the relation of church and state.[75] Johann Gerhard intended to base

[73] Ibid., pp. 271–79.

[74] See Robert von Friedeburg, *The Making of Popular Cultures of Social Control: A Comparison of Essex (England) and Hesse-Cassel (Germany) during the Reformation*, in *Social Control in Europe, Volume I, 1500–1800*, eds. Herman Roodenburg et al. (Columbus, 2004), pp. 247–66; John C. Stalnaker, "Residenzstadt und Reformation: Religion, Politics and Social Policy in Hesse, 1509–1546," in *Marburger Geschichte*, ed. Erhart Deltmering (Marburg, 1980), pp. 297–322. For an overview on the sequestration, cf. H.J. Cohn, "Church Property in the German Protestant Principalities," in *Politics and Religion in Reformation Europe*, eds. E.I. Louri and Tom Scott (New York, 1987), pp. 158–87.

[75] See Albrecht Pius Luttenberger, *Glaubenseinheit und Reichsfriede. Konzeptionen und Wege konfessionsneutraler Reichspolitik 1530–1552 (Kurpfalz, Jülich, Kurbrandenburg)* (Göttingen,

his own description of the *ius episcopale* of the prince on his interpretation of the Treaty of Passau[76] although this treaty itself did not define, and could not have done so, a *ius episcopale* transfered to princes.[77] The major five articles defining the planned compromise—the release of Landgrave Philip, compromise on issues of religion, addressing other problems, France, and end of hostilities—had already been defined in the same order by the Saxon chancellor Mordeisen in the context of negotiations at Linz on 19 April 1552. However, before 30 May and the beginning of negotiations at Passau, Charles suffered further military defeats so that he could be pressed into further compromises.[78] Moritz, representing the princes at war with the emperor, insisted that the conflicts about religion rested on no more than abuses, while no single core issue of Christian doctrine was actually in dispute. Thus, the emperor and the estates adhering to the Augsburg Confession could make peace and guarantee mutual safety to one other and to all other imperial estates in the empire, rather than continuing war "*der religion halben*". A national council was to decide on any disputed issue, but even if such a council was not going to deliver a solution, peace should nevertheless be maintained.[79] The two main constituents of the plan presented to Charles—to separate issues of law, peace and religion and thus to disentangle any compromise from solutions achieved by the theologians—necessarily meant that the definitions of "church" used in the protocols of the negotiations or referred to by later interpretations had not, and could not have, anything to do with the meaning of "church" for the adherents of either Rome or the Augsburg Confession.

This is neither the place to recapitulate the resistance of Charles to this program nor to go into the reasons for its eventual acceptance by the Catholic ecclesiastical princes.[80] In effect, the actual conclusions at Passau referred the establishment of a final agreement to another imperial diet and remained, in that respect, transitory, but they encapsulated an evolving solution for disentangling the issue of the *Landfrieden* from the theological disputes.

1982), pp. 651–55; idem, in *Der Passauer Vertrag von 1552. Politische Entstehung, reichsrechtliche Bedeutung und konfessionsgeschichtliche Bewertung*, ed. Winfried Becker, pp. 56–84.

[76] Honecker, *Cura Religionis*, pp. 99–105.

[77] *Der Passauer Vertrag. Einleitung und Edition*, ed. Volker Henning Drecoll (Berlin, 2000).

[78] Ibid., pp. 15–19.

[79] Ibid., pp. 25–26. Program for negotiations presented by Moritz from 1 June 1552, quoted as ibid., p. 25.

[80] See Horst Rabe, *Reich und Glaubensspaltung*, passim.

Augsburg

The Religious Peace of Augsburg specified that Protestants could keep the possessions of Catholic estates confiscated before 1552. It contained no formulation specifying the future of the possessions of Catholic estates not subordinate to the empire (*mittelbare Stände*). That meant that for ecclesiastical possessions of estates not yet reformed by 1552 the older regulations could be understood to remain intact. Any further confiscation of church property could be construed to be illegal. Protestants, however, neither shared this interpretation nor recognized the so-called *reservatum ecclesiasticum* that deprived Catholic prelates of their lands and rights if they converted.[81] In effect, imperial civil estates limited what was from the 1580s on called the *ius reformandi*[82] (paragraph 15 of the Religious Peace) to the possessions of ecclesiastical estates not immediately responsible to the emperor and *somehow* "in their territories". Only the reformation of ecclesiastical institutions not immediately responsible to the emperor and completed by 1552 was to be covered. To what extent that covered the possessions of Catholic estates immediately responsible to the emperor within the princely lands and what "in their" meant anyway remained subject to dispute. As we will see, the geographical location of a possession was not, in itself, deemed sufficient to define this possession as "in their" lands. Catholic interpretations insisted that at the very least all possessions of Catholic estates immediately responsible to the emperor were henceforth safe from any infringement and that those prelates choosing to change their faith had to lose their office and rights. That effectively restricted the further possibility for reformation to hitherto unreformed secular principalities and the church lands within them (whatever "within them" meant) of ecclesiastical estates that were not immediate responsible to

[81] See Heinz Schilling, Heribert Smolinsky, eds., *Der Augsburger Religionsfrieden* (Münster, 2007). Arno Buschmann, "Kaiser und Reich. Verfassungsgeschichte des Heiligen Römischen Reiches Deutscher Nation vom Beginn des 12. Jahrhunderts bis zum Jahre 1806," in *Dokumenten, Teil I: Vom Wormser Konkordat 1122 bis zum Augsburger Reichsabschied von 1555* (Baden-Baden, 1994), pp. 215–83, p. 224, Paragraph 15, providing that the emperor and imperial estates will not attack or otherwise endanger the adherents of the Augsburg Confession for the sake of this confession or act against their conscience, wills, religion, belief, order, "so sie aufgericht oder nochmals aufrichten möchten, in ihren Fürstenthumen, Landen und Herrschaften…" Paragraph 16: the adherents of the "old religion" are protected against further infringements. Paragraph 18 stipulates on prelates changing to the Augsburg confession. See Luttenberger, *Glaubenseinheit*; idem, *Kurfürsten, Kaiser und Reich: Politische Führung und Friedenssicherung unter Ferdinand I. und Maximilian II* (Mainz, 1994). On recent historiography and context, see also Friedeburg, "'Officium in rempublicam'".

[82] Schneider, *Ius Reformandi.*

the emperor. For the period before 1552 the Passau *clausula* declaring all opposing interpretations void made the reformations pursued *to this* point (that is up to 1552) relatively secure. An exception proved to be the duchy of Württemberg, which had been reformed after the enforced return of Duke Ulrich in the 1530s, but that had been occupied by imperial forces in 1548 and had then seen a *return* of church property to Rome. Thus, in the case of Württemberg, the retrieval of these possessions after 1552 by the duke could be construed as not being covered by the Passau and Augsburg agreements, and was thus disputed after 1629 in the wake of the Edict of Restitution. The wording of the Peace of Augsburg thus included three kinds of law: non-confessional law that, by inclusion of heretics into the peace of the land, had made this peace possible; law addressing both faiths, though interpreted by each confession in very different ways, and confessional law in the sense of specific privileges for one faith, particularly the prohibition of any further reformation of ecclesiastical estates of the empire.[83]

Two issues should be kept in mind. Lutherans, both theologians and lawyers, were, of course, aware of the fragile nature of the Religious Peace and the disputed nature of their own interpretation of it. To an extent, their main issue remained not so much their churches' relationship with their own princes but rather the continuing threat of Catholicism; especially from the 1570s, particularly from the reign of Emperor Rudolf on, as confrontation began to replace cooperation. Second, the technical civil terms of Passau and Augsburg were not so much seen as a threat to the necessary spiritual independence of the spiritual, universal, and particular church, but as a wall necessary to protect, by law, what had been achieved.

From The Religious Peace of Augsburg to Johann Gerhard, 1555–1620s
Lutheran "Confessionalisation" and the effect of doctrinal conflicts on the relation of the civil magistrate and the church

Neither 1552 nor 1555 ended doctrinal conflicts that had broken out in full force after Luther's death in 1546. Matthias Flacius for one did not accept Passau or Augsburg as bringing to conclusion issues of faith but regarded them as political agreements only. Thomas Kaufmann contends that this refusal to submit to the political peace and strife about doctrinal truths remained important within 16th-century German

[83] Honecker, *Cura Religionis*, pp. 21–22.

Protestantism; it also poses the question as to the extent to which we can understand Lutheranism to be an entity. One example is the bitter conflict in Jena.[84] Another is the conflict in Magdeburg in the later 1560s. The town fathers finally insisted on being responsible for civil peace and thus also for imposing *de facto* judgements on the warring clergymen.[85] In Ernestine Saxony the Weimar consistorial regulation of 1561 solved the problem to the detriment of ministers and professors of theology. The power of excommunication was placed in the hands of the consistory, under the duke. Its other members were four clergymen, two lawyers and two representatives of the nobility. Some Jena theologians charged that in this kind of organization the "freedom of the church" fell victim to the "imperial papacy" of the territorial prince (*Kayserliche Bapstumb*).[86] One way to look at the consequences of bitter doctrinal conflict among Luther's adherents concerning the relationship of the civil magistrate to the church is that one group, i.e., that of Flacius, insisted on the unconditional pre-eminence of theological truth and its implementation through learned discourse and ecclesiastical discipline, and contended that it conflicted with the aims of territorial princely policy in Ernestine Saxony, which was only prepared to permit this in respect of ecclesiastical issues in the more narrow sense.[87] In any case, doctrinal conflicts overlapped and coincided with unresolved questions about the nature of the organisation and rule of the church.

The emergence of the formulae "ius reformandi" and cuius regio—eius religio, 1555–1610s

As mentioned above, Luther and Melanchthon had made the reform of abuses a duty of Christian magistrates and had insisted that the church and issues of faith needed to remain free of any constraint, as part of Christ's realm. Christian princes had this duty in common with all Christians, but particularly because of their office. They had to do everything within their means to allow the preaching of the gospel. No one can be constrained or forced to believe; a choice of faith (as

[84] See essay I above, on the structural continuity of these conflicts.
[85] Friedeburg, *Self Defense*, pp. 87–89.
[86] Quoted as Kaufmann, "Anfänge," p. 257.
[87] Ibid., p. 258; for a more principled stand on the responsibility of princes to direct the life of the church, e.g., via censorship, see Hans Peter Hasse, *Zensur theologischer Bücher in Kursachsen im konfessionellen Zeitalter. Studien zur kursächsischen Literatur- und Religionspolitik in den Jahren 1569 bis 1575* (Leipzig, 2000).

stipulated for secular imperial estates in 1555) is neither an option for Christian subjects nor for Christian magistrates.[88] At the very least after 1555, the meaning of "church" as stipulated politically in 1552/1555 differed indeed greatly from that given by Luther and the reformers.

According to current research, systematic theology did contribute much in the period after 1555 to systematize what had been achieved. For example, Martin Chemnitz, a prominent student of Melanchthon, adopted his terminology of *custodia utriusque tabulae* and *praecipuum membrum ecclesiae*. He did submit the choice of ministers to the civil magistrate, but only in the case of a *pius magistratus*. The church needed to be heard, for even the *pius magistratus* "*non est tota ecclesia*," "*sed tantum membrum eius*".[89] The main developments of these concepts took place rather *ad hoc* in the myriad of court battles ensuing in the next fifty years. Here, Bernd Schneider's research is groundbreaking.[90] A number of practices were established along the way. The *Patronatsrecht* itself did not carry *ius reformandi*, as Lutheran knights in eastern Hesse learned when their prince turned to Calvinism, and they were denied the right to choose Lutheran ministers in their villages.[91] But where territorial estates had sufficient negotiating muscle, as the estates in Upper and Lower Austria (not least due to the Turkish threat at the borders), Lutheran *exercitium publicum* was enshrined in successive negotiations between princes and estates, even as the Habsburg princes after Maximilian attempted to support the Counter-Reformation as much as possible. This situation changed only after the battle at the White Mountain (1620). While Lutheran theologians and lawyers outside Austria remained just as cautious as the Austrian estates to formulate any explicit theory of resistance, since the placing of territorial suzerainty in the hands of the Habsburg princes remained undisputed as such, the demand for freedom of conscience, identified with freedom of religion, and the subsequent identification of the practice of Lutheran worship as an allegedly ancient—and inviolable—constitutional right served as reasons to deny compliance with the princes unless they allowed Lutheran worship.[92] As will be clear below, the right of towns and noble estates that were

[88] See in particular Luther's 1523 *Von Weltlicher Obrigkeit*; Schneider, *Ius Reformandi*, pp. 74–75.

[89] Martin Chemnitz, *Loci Theologici*, ed Polycarp Leyser (Frankfurt/M, 1653), "de ecclesia," c4, 123, quoted as Schneider, *Ius Reformandi*, p. 174.

[90] Ibid., pp. 203–322.

[91] Ibid., p. 206.

[92] Ibid., pp., 208–09. See also Strohmeyer, *Konfessionskonflikt*, e.g., pp. 189, 319.

not imperial estates, but neither were simple subjects, to profit from the Peace of Religion by insisting on their freedom of conscience, remained a major issue in some discussions of the relationship of Lutheran territorial churches to civil magistrates. At the same time, the successful Counter-Reformation in Bavaria and southern German ecclesiastical principalities such as Würzburg, showed how fragile Lutheran worship remained in the face of Catholic princes.[93]

Despite the legal fragility of the Lutheran position, even before the outbreak of the Thirty Years War, Lutheran estates and clergy not only withstood the efforts of some princes to change the Lutheran faith, as in Austria, Saxony (1586–1591), or Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel,[94] three princes had to officially submit their choice among faiths to their estates in order to secure the Lutheran faith. Already in 1565 Duke Christoph of Württemberg had to bow to the relatively strong institutionalized power of the urban estates and to guarantee to his estates the further exercise of Lutheranism although there was no obvious sign of conversion by him. The estates rather proceeded to substantiate their already strong position in reaction to the frequent changes of confession in the neighboring Palatinate.[95] In 1611 Johann Albrecht II failed to impose Calvinism in Mecklenburg. The estates, towns, knights, and the clergy, resisted, supported by the Wittenberg theologians. In 1621 the prince had to sign a contract that stated that the whole duchy would exclusively adhere to the Lutheran faith of the Unaltered Augsburg Confession.[96] Finally, Johann Sigismund, elector of Brandenburg, was hardly able to issue an edict prohibiting attacks on Calvinism in March 1614 after he had made his own conversion public in December 1613. In February 1615 he had to state publicly that everyone who wished to do so could adhere to the Augsburg Confession and the Book of Concord. Even where Sigismund owned the *Patronat*, he had to allow Lutheran

[93] See David Luebke, *Counterreformation* (Malden, MA, 1999); Arno Herzig, *Der Zwang zum wahren Glauben. Rekatholisierung vom 16. zum 18. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen, 2000).

[94] Beside Austria see, e.g., for the eventual defeat of the efforts of Elector Christian I of Saxony (1591) and the fall of chancellor Krell after his death, Karl-Heinz Blaschke, "Religion und Politik in Kursachsen 1586–1591," in *Die reformierte Konfessionalisierung in Deutschland—das Problem der Zweiten Reformation*, ed. Heinz Schilling (Gütersloh, 1986), pp. 79–97; Sommer, *Lutherischen Hofprediger*, pp. 101–17; on Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel see Luise Schorn-Schütte, "Lutherische Konfessionalisierung: Das Beispiel Braunschweig Wolfenbüttel (1589–1613)," in *Die lutherische Konfessionalisierung in Deutschland*, ed. Hans-Christoph Rublack (Gütersloh, 1992), pp. 163–98.

[95] Schneider, *Ius Reformandi*, p. 210.

[96] Ibid., p. 211.

ministers to be chosen by the parishes. Calvinism remained restricted to the capital Berlin, the court, and the direct servants of the prince.[97] Outside Berlin, particularly in the countryside and small towns dominated by the greater and lesser nobility, the princes' choice in religion hardly made a difference; in particular, large, powerful families such as the von Alvenslebens chose for their own *Patronate* the persons they thought fit.[98]

In these cases of massive and successful support from the territorial estates in favor of Lutheran *exercitium publicum*, from Saxony to Austria, from Württemberg to Mecklenburg, formal agreements between estates and princes became more or less standard elements of the emerging constitution of what was going to be consolidated as princely territories. More often than not, the defense of Lutheranism became closely connected with the struggle of territorial estates for room for political and legal maneuvering within the new emerging entity. The resistance by the estates in favor of Lutheranism must undoubtedly be taken seriously, as must the sermons preached by Lutheran ministers against heretical princes. But again, the extent to which ministers themselves favored dependence on noble *Patronatsherren* unbridled by princely supervision or the powers of princely consistories depended on individual circumstances and perspectives. Cases where Lutheran clergymen supported a prince in return for some form of protection against noble estates attempting to exploit the clergy and the property of the church for their own good are not necessarily evidence of Lutheran submission to state authority from some yen for authoritarianism.[99]

Despite the considerable successes of Lutheran estates in Austria, Württemberg, Brandenburg, and Mecklenburg before 1620, conceptual change developed instead in cases before the imperial courts on issues of ecclesiastical property. One core problem became the reformation

---

[97] Ibid., pp. 210–11.

[98] Bodo Nischan, *Prince, people, and confession: the Second Reformation in Brandenburg*, (Philadelphia, 1994); Peter Michael Hahn, *Fürstliche Territorialhoheit und lokale Adelsgewalt: die herrschaftliche Durchdringung des ländlichen Raumes zwischen Elbe und Aller (1300–1700)* (Berlin, 1989).

[99] Finally, we should not ignore that in the case of the archbishopric of Cologne, the Catholic territorial estates attempted to defend the sole exercise of Catholicism against Gebhardt Truchsess von Waldburg, who had been elected under dubious circumstances (Schneider, *Ius reformandi*, p. 221), proceeded in 1580 to marry his mistress and allowed Lutheran services in 1583. Needless to say, neither in the Lutheran nor in the Catholic case should we see resistance by the estates in any sense as in keeping with modern notions of toleration or liberty.

of ecclesiastical *Hochstifte* after 1552: this was primarily a North German development (but examples include Magdeburg, Strasbourg, and Cologne), where *Geistliche Vorbehalt* was violated by installing the sons of Protestant princes.[100] Another concerned the situation of imperial cities and the degree to which they had to accept Catholic subjects or Catholic public service. The status of magistrates in imperial cities became an issue, as did the status of imperial counts and knights and their right to enforce a reformation on, for example, an abbey immediately responsible to the emperor. In such cases especially, which were contested between 1596 and 1598, the issue of the precise meaning of territorial suzerainty and its connection to the *ius reformandi* showed a way to resolve in detail what had been addressed in 1555. By the 1590s the answer to this question had become *ius territorii et superioritatis*,[101] resulting in a new category that by 1600 was in itself being used to systematize rights between estates in the empire. In 1600 Andreas Knichen's *De Iure territorii* would start to assume a large number of heterogeneous jurisdictional and other rights under this new all encompassing category.

In these cases, however, the issue became less the relationship of church and state as such as the application of the compromises of 1552 and 1555 to the status of various groups in the empire.[102] As with magistrates of imperial cities or abbeys, many groups and persons in the empire were neither simple subjects nor possessors of an undisputed *ius territorii*. Indeed, right into the 17th century, distinctions were made between certain more traditional rights, such as *iurisdictio superior*, and the right to reform the church, without recourse to the new vocabulary of *ius territorii*. Even as the possession of *ius territorii* became a major touchstone for claiming rights over the church, the question of who possessed it remained open and was hotly disputed, for instance, with regard to imperial knights.[103]

The "four monastery-case" demonstrates the importance of legal niceties in this issue. The main problem did not so much concern the relationship of Lutheran subjects to their princes (despite the various

[100] Schneider states that Protestants proceeded often with the utmost care to maintain the proper canonical forms, ibid., p. 218.

[101] Ibid., pp. 237–39.

[102] Ibid., p. 240; Willoweit, *Territorialgewalt*, passim.

[103] Schneider, *Ius reformandi*, pp. 239–41, on the controversial legal opinions on the right of urban magistrates and imperial knights to determine church issues for their subjects.

conflicts already mentioned), but the conflict between the two confessions in the empire as a whole, for which arguments taken from the sphere of the relationship between church and civil magistrate became so vital.[104] At the core of this litigation remained the question of what precisely subjected an ecclesiastical institution—in this case, four monasteries—to territorial superiority, and thus to the right to be reformed. The issue of geographical location was only one—and a disputed—piece of possible evidence on this issue. One of the four cases, the occupation by the count of Öttingen, had been disputed by the Carthusian order in 1556. Öttingen stressed that the last prior had become a Protestant and had submitted the monasteries to the Augsburg Confession, and that not simple occupation, but "Christian reform" was the issue. However, in 1599 the count was finally ordered to restore the monasteries fully.[105] The complaint of another monastery against imperial knights stagnated in the 1590s. As Christoph Besold later argued, the difference between "*in territorio*," (being geographically located in the lands of a magistrate with *ius territorii* over his lands) and "*de territorio*" (being actually subjected to this law) was used in order to defy the counts of Öttingen.[106] Suffice it to say that Schneider shows that the Lutheran side tended to argue from the alleged *spirit* of 1552 and 1555, from the general idea that those with *ius territorii* should be able to reform the church, while the Catholic side attempted to adhere to the actual compromises stated literally in the texts. Lutherans attempted to distill from the texts a general right of civil magistrates, Catholics denied this. Lutheran lawyers thus attempted to construct a coherent "*facultas reformandi in suis territoriis*" for their employers but also argued on behalf of vassals and estates. The *Reichskammergericht*, in any case, was by no means certain on the basis of the stipulations of 1552 and 1555 that possession of territorial superiority bestowed a right to appropriate the rights and lands of Catholic corporations in that area.[107] As the Bavarian dukes subjected their subjects, such as the

[104] See Dietrich Kratsch, *Justiz, Religion und Politik. Das Reichskammergericht und die Klosterprozesse im ausgehenden 16. Jahrhundert* (Tübingen, 1990).

[105] Schneider, *Ius Reformandi.*, pp. 243–44.

[106] See Kratsch, *Justiz*, pp. 62–210.

[107] Ibid., pp. 140–51, p 140: "Die Befugnis des Landesherren zur Herstellung der konfessionellen Einheit wurde zweifelhaft, wenn das Reichskammergericht äusserte, das Recht zur Änderung der Religion [by the civil imperial estates for themselves and toward their common subjects] berechtigte noch nicht zur Vertreibung eines Ordens". See also Schneider, *Ius Reformandi*, pp. 246, 249.

counts of Ortenburg, to counter-reformation, the issue became one of whether the immediate responsibility of a person to the emperor also applied to that person's lands, particularly if those lands were fiefs to another prince. More importantly, the Protestants argued that *all* vassals, as long as their fief was still legally held, had the right to free exercise of religion, and that this also pertained not only to their own lands but also to their fiefs. Indeed, Lutheran argument was quite capable of qualifying the principle of *ius territorii* if that served the interest of the public exercise of the Lutheran faith. However, the right of estates not to be forced into a religion was never accepted by the Catholic side, and even the Protestants themselves were cautious to refer to the *Declaratio Ferdinandea*. Because their legal application was so dubious, Lutheran lawyers tended to argue even more boldly that subjects in general had been part of the Religious Peace and could thus claim, under religious freedom of conscience, an *exercitium privatum* in their own home,[108] a view later systematized by Besold as a right by law of nature (see below). Again, while someone like Besold *could* refer to Luther on this issue, at least as important for the development of this line of argument were the tactical considerations how best to argue under given circumstances.

Since the 1590s, the reception of Jean Bodin had accelerated significant changes in German political thought, particularly with respect to the nature of sovereignty in the empire.[109] A specific genre on politics, the *Politica*, emerged from the commentaries on Aristotle. Public law in the empire began to be treated as a subject in its own right.[110] The emerging literature on imperial public law (*Publizistik, Reichspublizistik*) took up this general argument about freedom of conscience and also reemerged in practical negotiations, for example, in Austria between princes and estates.[111] At the same time the Lutheran argument, advanced partly by the very influential Stephani brothers, concentrated on the rights of princes who had taken over the rights of bishops and were, on the whole, willing to sacrifice the right of subjects or estates

[108] Ibid., pp. 253–55, 261–63, 265.

[109] J.H.M. Salmon, "The Legacy of Jean Bodin: Absolutism, Populism or Constitutionalism?" *History of Political Thought* 17 (1996), 500–22, 507–12.

[110] See Michael Stolleis, *Geschichte des öffentlichen Rechts*, 2 vols, Munich; Robert von Friedeburg, "Holy Roman Empire, Part II: 1555–1700," in *European Political Thought, 1450–1700*, eds. Glenn Burgess and Howell Lloyd (New Haven, 2007); Dietmar Willoweit, *Territorialgewalt*.

[111] See Strohmeyer, *Konfessionskonflikt*, passim; Schneider, *Ius Reformandi*. p. 271.

to exercise the religion of their choice for that preference.[112] They did so, however, leaving most fundamental issues disputed. Catholics, for instance, claimed that all ecclesiastical holdings immediately subject to the emperor had to be restored, and further all ecclesiastical property that had been Catholic at any time between 1552 and 1555 (given the changes since 1555, a claim for a massive restitution) and emphatically *denied* any general right of reformation tied to a *ius territorii*.[113] Among Lutherans the Stephani brothers were the first to systematically attempt to justify the position which Lutherans assigned princes within the legal and constitutional arrangements of the empire. They posited the exercise of episcopal rights by civil magistrates and advocated the connection of these rights to the right of territorial superiority: "*ut cuius sit regio, hoc est ducatus, principatus, territorium seu ius territorii, eius etiam sit religio, hoc es ius episcopale, seu iurisdictio spiritualis*".[114] The issue of the origin of this connection became intertwined with the issue of *iura circa sacra* and *iura in sacra*, between actual preaching and the administration of the adiaphora. Princely possession of *Patronat* (material and personal rights over a parsonage, including the right to present a minister to the relevant authorities for further service) and *Vogtei* (the right to protect and control the church in a given area or jurisdiction) had traditionally been a part of a heterogeneous variety of princely rights, but most authors recognized that the *ius reformandi* was a new right which came only into existence with the agreements of 1552 and 1555. However, this new right was still connected more closely to older, existing princely rights than to the new term *ius territorialis*.[115] Anyone attempting to place the *ius reformandi*, as the right to choose between Roman Catholicism and the Augsburg Confession and to impose that choice on their subjects, faces a more systematic problem within imperial law that it could not be understood as an episcopal right in any sense, even if it was broadly accepted that estates immediately responsible to the empire and adhering to the Augsburg Confession now were exercising rights that in Catholic areas were exercised by bishops. Indeed, the idea of such exercise as an emergency measure had been part of the practical aspects of Reformation thought. But it remained entirely impossible

[112] Ibid., pp. 271, 296.
[113] Ibid., pp. 290–91.
[114] J. Stephani, *Institutiones, liber I*, c 7, n. 52, quoted from Schneider, *Ius Reformandi*, pp. 310–12.
[115] Ibid., pp. 315–16.

for either Lutherans or Catholics to think of any clergyman as having a free choice between two mutually excluding faiths.[116] To Catholics, Lutherans remained heretics, and they thus insisted on the *reservatum ecclesiasticum* to prevent such a choice, at least for their own clergy. Lutherans hoped that adherents of Rome still might see the light; they thus argued in favor of such choice, but only because they hoped that would help spread the Reformation. Neither confession could possibly accept the spirit of mediation, prudence, and utility that had made 1552 and 1555 possible.[117] In stressing this point, Schneider shows that the writings of the Stephani brothers and later Besold suggested, in more or less differentiated and contradictory ways, that the *ius reformandi* must have come from elsewhere, for it could not have come from the bishops. Only in a process of contradictory and fragmented argument did this conclusion increasingly dominate public law during the first half of the 17th century. Authors like Besold understood the *ius reformandi* as part of territorial superiority, not least because it could not be understood to be a right devolved from the powers of bishops. Bishops plainly could not be conceived of having ever been privileged to choose among two confessions, one of which had to be heretical. Thus, the *ius reformandi* had to be connected to another realm of legal privilege. Authors such as "Besold, Carpov, and Engelbrecht concluded (what the Stephani Brothers around 1600 did not dare to write) that there must be a right of civil authority (*obrigkeitliches Kirchenrecht*) beyond and above episcopal jurisdiction and its devolution to princes".[118]

Against this background the period from Gerhard's *Loci Theologici* onward produced a substantial conceptual change in the understanding of the relationship of church to civil magistrate, very much in favor of a more substantial and coherent defense of the role of the civil magistrate. It is precisely this period, however, that experienced the most substantial successes of Lutheran estates and clergy against counter-

[116] Ronald Asch, "No Bishop, No King oder Cuius Regio eius religio. Die Deutung und Legitimation des fürstlichen Kirchenregiments und ihre Implikationen für die Genese des 'Absolutismus' in England und im protestantischen Deutschland," in *Der Absolutismus—ein Mythos? Strukturwandel monarchischer Herrschaft in West- und Mitteleuropa (ca. 1550–1700)*, ed. Heinz Duchhardt and Ronald Asch (Cologne, 1996), pp. 86–87, on the significant variations and differentiations in the argument of Stephani.

[117] Friedeburg, *Germany I: 1450–1555*, in *A History of European Political Thought*, ed. Howell Lloyd (New Haven, 2007).

[118] Schneider, *Ius Reformandi*, pp. 312, 318. On the relation of this development to the crisis of religious peace in Germany from the 1580s, see Asch, "No Bishop," pp. 79–123.

reformational or Calvinist princes, as in Mecklenburg, Brandenburg or Austria. A coherent theory concerning the civil magistrate did thus not, automatically, mean subjection to any magistrate and his orders.

Ius reformandi, iura in sacra and iura circa sacra: Gerhard and Besold

Following the research of Johannes Heckel, the Reformed Heidelberg theologian David Pareus is credited with introducing the distinction between *iura circa sacra* and *iura in sacra*.[119] This innovation was taken over and combined into a new synthesis by Johann Gerhard, the towering figure of Lutheran Orthodoxy and a prime subject of interest throughout the last century, from Troeltsch to Schneider.[120] Gerhard's main aim was to provide a coherent system of theology and particularly ecclesiology to counter Catholic arguments denying the legitimacy of the Lutheran church, especially by theologians such as Robert Bellarmine.[121] Faced with the threat from counter-reformational Catholic attempts to redraw the confessional map of the empire from the later 16th century, Gerhard attempted to deliver a systematic theological explanation of the place of the civil magistrate in the church while simultaneously proving the legitimacy and legality of the actions of Protestant princes, as the main bulwark for Lutheranism against Rome. In order to combine the influence of the civil magistrate given to imperial estates in 1552 and 1555 with a theological vision of the church, he linked these rights to the three-estate theory. Constitutionally, the place of the civil magistrate was to be defended, within the empire, by recourse to Passau and Augsburg. This was based on the point that, historically, civil magistrates had only recovered rights that had been held unlawfully by Catholic bishops and had been returned where they belonged.[122] In ecclesiology, the civil magistrate took his place in the church prescribed by three-estate theory.[123] Gerhard attempted to

[119] Ibid., pp. 98, 101.
[120] Troeltsch, *Vernunft*.
[121] Honecker, *Cura Religionis*, pp. 14–15.
[122] See also Heckel, "Staat und Kirche," pp. 73, 171, on the general insistence that bishops in the early Christian church were similar to ministers and only possessed the *ministerium verbi*, referring e.g. to Rittershusius, *Ius Justinianeum*. Again, the confrontation with Counter-Reformation papacy and its claim to the sole right to install bishops.
[123] Honecker, pp. 72–75.

balance the spiritual and concrete aspects of church life (preaching, administration of the sacraments) by distinguishing the spiritual and invisible church, God's assembly on earth, and the visible particular church, the *polis*-church of a given *civitas*. In this specific respect, Gerhard did not differ from Henning Arnisaeus, the main proponent of the essentially secular approach of Neo-Aristotelianism.[124] However, he insisted that preaching the gospel and administering the sacraments connected both and made them two aspects of the very same entity.[125] While this secures the precedence of faith before all other "outer" signs and the "*Unverfügbarkeit des Glaubens*," the visible church is described, according to Honecker, in categories derived from Melanchthon's understanding of "*societas*" rather than from Luther's emphasis on the "Word". That "*societas*" is addressed in terms of the three estates.[126] Honecker emphasizes that Gerhard first introduced the three-estate theory as an architectural tool of his ecclesiology but turned it into an argument for the different functions of the estates in the church, leaving the third estate a say only in issues of vocation, while assigning to the magistrate substantial duties, including ecclesiastical jurisdiction and the calling of synods. The particular church is lead by the *Wehrstand* (the civil magistrate) and *Lehrstand* (the ministers).[127]

Gerhard used as sources not only Scripture and the church fathers but also Aristotle and ecclesiastical history, with special recourse to Constantine, Theodosius, and Justinian.[128] Thereby, the character of the particular church was carved out as *polis* church.[129] He also, among a minority of theologians, made recourse to the Religious Peace to defend his contention that princes now hold episcopal rights. He regarded territorial rights as simply the entitlements establishing magistrates in the empire, and magistrates adhering to the Augsburg Confession clearly

[124] See Heckel, "Staat und Kirche," pp. 73, 206. On Arnisaeus' nearly secular theory of social and political life in the *res publica*, see Dreitzel, *Protestantischer Aristotelismus*; the fundamental differences between this semi-secular theory and the approach of the Christian *res publica christiana* is, following Dreitzel, summarized in "Germany II: 1555–1700," in *A History of European Political Thought* (New Haven, 2007).

[125] Honecker, *Cura Religionis*, pp. 51–58.

[126] Ibid., pp. 57–72. For another more recent interpretation, see Estes, *Peace, Order, and the Glory of God.*

[127] Ibid., pp. 72–78.

[128] Schneider, *Ius Reformandi*, pp. 174–175; Honecker, *Cura Religionis*, pp. 14–15.

[129] Ibid.

assumed episcopal rights.[130] Gerhard then distinguished between issues concerning *divinum cultum* and issues concerning *administrationem et externam dispositionem*.[131] Indeed, Gerhard explicitly distinguished *ecclesia visibilis* and *invisibilis* for this purpose. The civil magistrate is only responsible for *res externae et corporales*, not for the spiritual side of the church. He has to secure the peace, not transfer grace. Ecclesiastical discipline remained part of the *potestas interna*, as Gerhard stressed, especially in his ecclesiastical constitution, the *Casimiriana*, composed in 1626, after he had served in Coburg-Gotha, as superintendent in Heldburg (1606–1615) and then general-superintendent in Coburg (1615–1616). He had conducted one visitation and one general visitation, which led to the ordinances of 1626, which introduced a more comprehensive ecclesiastical discipline. According to this document, the consistory assigned ministers, examined them, and exercised jurisdiction in marital and ecclesiastical issues. It could excommunicate and supervised the regional superintendents. Written by Gerhard, but signed and delivered in the name of the duke, it derived from the *cura religionis* of the civil magistrate and his role in the church within three-estate theory as conceived by Gerhard. A whole chapter (§26) is solely dedicated to ecclesiastical discipline. The formulae used there, however, stress the evangelical meaning of ecclesiastical discipline while the role of the civil magistrate is hardly stressed.[132] Following Luther, no death penalty is envisioned for heretics. Becoming part of the ministry itself meant only a call to publicly preach the gospel. All three estates participated in calling pastors, but the ministerium had to test the ability of the candidate; the civil magistrate (in practice according to the *Patronatsrechte*) placed him in office. Most of the rights of the third estate were understood as being delegated to the Consistory.[133]

Constitutionally, the rights of civil magistrates are explained as part of the *ius episcopale* redirected in 1552/55 to civil magistrates.[134] None

[130] Johann Gerhard, *Loci Theologici*, ed. F. Frank (Leipzig, 1885), p. 350, §245. Cf. Schneider, *Ius reformandi*, p. 75.

[131] Gerhard, *Loci Theologici*, §178. Schneider, *Ius reformandi*, p. 175.

[132] Honecker, *Cura Religionis*, pp. 98–99, 41–50. For the slightly later period of Ernst the Pious, see Veronika Albrecht-Birkner, *Reformation des Lebens. Die Reformen Herzog Ernst des Frommen von Sachsen Gotha und ihre Auswirkungen auf Frömmigkeit, Schule und Alltag im ländlichen Raum* (1640–1675) (Leipzig, 2002).

[133] Honecker, *Cura Religionis*, p. 90.

[134] Ibid., pp. 103–105; Gerhard, *Loci theologici*, VI:80, §117; VI:76, §108; VI:350, §174; VI:365, §201.

of that, of course, is stipulated in the actual texts, for neither text could have made any statement about the *ius episcopale*; that would have been intruding into the rights of the Church of Rome. Gerhard rather systematized further the attempt to interpret what had been transferred in 1552/55 in these terms. The civil magistrate, holder of older episcopal rights allegedly according to imperial constitutional law, was justified in exercising some of them but was denied exercise of others, for his place in the church differed from that of the Catholic bishop. His rights included the installation of ministers, the organisation of provisions for the parishes, appointment of ecclesiastical supervisers, and the implementation of ecclesiastical constitutions, such as Johann Casimir's.[135] The episcopal right of *ordo* is deferred to the clergy. Honecker believes that this argument makes sense in the context of imperial law and in terms of legalizing the actions of Protestant civil magistrates.[136] The theological argument for their action remains rooted in their *cura religionis* as civil magistrates and their place as *membrum praecipuum ecclesiae* in three-estate theory. In Gerhard's interpretation, however, examples of this role are Roman emperors such as Constantine,[137] or Charlemagne, who governed the *res publica Christiana*. The example of Old Testament theocracy and the classical *polis*-church were combined with religion, following Cicero, as the most important bases of human society.[138] Within this combination, the civil magistrate had to share the religion of the particular church; his rights and influence extended, according to Honecker, far beyond the external, visible church, particularly in making law for the church and assembling synods.[139] Under these conditions tolerating heretics was suggested as prudent but may also be inevitable given the legal rights of estates in a restricted principality. In any case, while public order and public worship needed to be protected, no subject could be forced to believe. Faith cannot and must not be spread with the sword, and the magistrate remains, like

[135] Honecker, *Cura Religionis*, pp. 105–07.

[136] Ibid., pp. 107–112. Gerhard, *Loci theologici*, VI:77, §112. On the concept of the Christian *res publica Christiana* in Catholic, Reformed, and Lutheran accounts in the Empire, see "Germany II", in *European Political Thought*.

[137] See also Heckel, "Staat und Kirche," pp. 73, 146, on the importance of the example of Byzantium and Byzantine law, and, on p. 164, the reception of Canon law as part of the imperial law and the increasing importance of the emerging Public Law of the empire and the Byzantine elements in Canon and Roman law.

[138] Honecker, *Cura Religionis*, pp. 112–14; Gerhard, *Loci theologici*, VI:348.

[139] Honecker, *Cura Religionis*, pp. 118–20.

the clergy, without power over souls.[140] Public worship and defense of public peace must be enforced by the magistrate, but belief must not be enforced with the sword.[141]

Two issues should be kept in mind. First, Gerhard was cautious with respect to the enforcement of religion. While all authors he cited, from Lipsius to Bellarmine, insist on only one religion in the state, Gerhard distinguished between what might be desired and what is realistic in a world where people differ in opinion. Particularly, it was necessary to make certain distinctions between opinion and open blasphemy. Princes in Germany were not absolute rulers, either, and had to allow those who were not simple subjects a certain degree of latitude.[142] None of that amounts to outright toleration, but it suggests a degree of practical latitude not only for reasons of prudence, but also because faith remains beyond what any human agency can enforce.

Second, as still the later publication of Herman Conring's *Pro pace perpetua Protestantibus danda consultatio Catholica*, published as Irenaeus Eubolos (1648), shows, the most important issue remained the threat of the Jesuit propaganda, of restitution and counter-reformation.[143] Successfully attempting to appeal to Catholic scholars and diplomats, it argues primarily in favor of the peace, and thus of a final acceptance of "heretics".[144] The piece confirms that for Lutherans right up to 1648, defense of what had been achieved in 1555 and what had been proven to be very fragile in 1629 to 1635 remained a priority.

Besold

Christoph Besold[145] retained a strong emphasis on the devolution of many rights of princes over the church from episcopal rights, but he also acknowledged that new rights had been created in 1555 and that this

---

[140] Ibid., pp. 121–25; Gerhard, *Loci theologici*, VI:365, §200, 456, §333, 360:§198.

[141] Honecker, *Cura Religionis*, p. 123; Gerhard, *Loci theologici*, VI:365, §200, with reference to the New Testament.

[142] Gerhard, *Loci theologici*, VI:363–365, §200; Schneider, *Ius Reformandi*, p. 180.

[143] See also Heckel, "Staat und Kirche," pp. 73, 132, 138, 152, on the core value of the Peace of Religion for Lutherans as a bulwark against Counter-Reformation Catholicism and on the Lutheran struggle against the idea that any civil magistrate, emperor or prince, is in need of papal approval for his legitimacy, and p. 220 on Gerhard as major opponent of the Jesuits.

[144] Schneider, *Ius Reformandi*, pp. 196–99.

[145] On Besold, Dreitzel, *Absolutismus*; Barbara Zeller-Lorenz, *Christoph Besold (1577–1638) und die Klosterfrage* (Tübingen, 1986). His conversion (1630/35) and the unusually

new right was a "*sequela superioritatis territorialis*". However, at least until the mid-17th century, that still meant acknowledging both the exercise of episcopal rights and the new *ius reformandi* and did not mean adding all authority over the church to territorial rule.[146] Besold distinguished, as was common in his time, between "*de territorio*" and "*in territorio*" but clearly connected the *ius reformandi* to the new *ius territorialis*. He did this, however, in a most remarkable way. Besold, the towering legal authority of Lutheran Germany during the 1620s, referred in his *De iure maiestate* (1625) to Luther and Gerhard to assert the following points: It displeases God if we make others pious ("*Es gefälle Gott nicht, wenn wir ander Leut begehren fromm zu machen*"); the law of nature gave every subject the right to a free conscience and to believe whatever he wants ("*Juris naturalis est, conscientiam liberam habere, & credere quicquid velit*").[147] Besold quoted Luther with his reminder that Christ was a Jew, and that if the Apostles, who also had been Jews, had treated us, the pagans, as we treat the Jews today, no pagan would ever have turned Christian.[148] Besold was not an outsider, but seven times rector of the University of Tübingen and one of the most frequently cited authorities on law and politics from the 1620s to the 1650s.[149]

Besold's statements on the notion of territory and religious freedom show how variable the framework of the emerging territorial state and particularly the legal interpretation of *cuius regio, eius religio* actually remained. Besold acknowledged various meanings of the term "territory" but emphasized one of them, the territory as a jurisdictional district in which a magistrate, lawfully instituted, exercised territorial law (i*us terrendi*).[150] But still in 1619, Besold himself distinguished between physically residing within a geographical area acknowledged to be in the possession of a prince ("*in eines Fürsten Land*"/"*in territorio*") and actual subjection to that prince ("*unter eines Fürsten Landsobrigkeit*"/"*de territorio*"), an oath of allegiance ("*Erbhuldigung*") being the major piece

complicated and chaotic state of his publications have so far prevented any comprehensive formation of a state of research on him similar to other major contemporaries.

[146] Schneider, *Ius Reformandi*, p. 317.

[147] Ibid. Christoph Besold, *De iure Maiestate* (Strasbourg, 1625), sectio II, De Ecclesiastico Majestatis Iure, c VI, pp. 130, 132.

[148] WA 11:314. Christoph Besold, *De Iure Ordinibusque Civium* (Strasbourg 1626), c V, "De Hebraeorum," p. 77.

[149] Dreitzel, *Absolutismus*, pp. 33–39.

[150] Christoph Besold, *De iure rerum… (6) de jure territorium*, (Strasbourg, 1624), p. 265.

of evidence.[151] In his 1620 *Political Principles* he insisted that violation of the principles of nature constituted tyranny.[152] He distinguished *maiestas realis*, exercised by the imperial diet, and *maiestas personalis*, exercised by the elected king, and referred to monarchomachs, such as Althusius and Danaeus, in arguing that the original source of authority remains the people.[153] The political unit as a whole, understood to be the *universitas*, that is, the legal (fictitious) person of the people as a body,[154] acting through its magistrates, has a right to defend damage to its laws and properties. This unit is addressed here as a "territory". In his account of territorial law, magistrates are explained to be *syndici* or procurators administering the rights and possessions of the corporate body in question.[155] While this defense pertains only to the lawful magistrate, the prince remains subordinated to the republic, the majesty of which he administers, and subjects have a right to resist at least in matters of religion; Besold cited Gerhard for support.[156]

In his *Praecognita politices* (1626) Besold defined some of the objectives of government in the *res publica*, among them, of course, religion. With reference to Johannes Staupitz, Valentin Weigel, and Johann Arndt, that is, with an emphasis on piety, Besold took not an anti-confessional but a decidedly non-confessional stance. At the core of this religion is the belief that God became human and that Christ died for sinners.[157] Besold's Law of Majesty is based on these other arguments but added an emphasis on the law of nature to provide a general fundamental law protecting the exercise of religion as it must be granted in a legitimate order. Besold distinguished, as was common, the primary law of nature (procreation, self-defense) from the secondary law of nature, the law of peoples (*ius gentium*). Intelligible by rational reason, this also includes the duty of obedience to one's fatherland and parents (*pietas in patriam*

[151] Christoph Besold, *De Aeraro publico* (Tübingen, 1619), pp. 89–90.

[152] Christoph Besold, *Politicorum libri duo* (Frankfurt, 1620), book I, paragraph 2, n. 35 (p. 39).

[153] Ibid., lib I, c II, n 2–4 (pp. 54–55).

[154] Christoph Besold, *De iure rerum… (5) aliarumque universitatum* (Strasbourg, 1624), pp. 224–34.

[155] Christoph Besold, *De iure rerum.… (6) ac item territorium*, (Strasbourg, 1624), c IV, pp. 241–44.

[156] Besold, *Politicorum Libri duo*, lib I, c 12, n 78; pp. 67–68: "universitas potest agere contra injuriantem.… universitas rerum communiter territorio appellatur," lib I, c IX, Paragraph 5, n 50, n 57, pp. 863–64: "Tunc enim Reipublicae, major quam Regis potestas est".

[157] Christoph Besold, *Praecognita Politices proposuit* (Strasbourg, 1626), c I, pp. 14–16.

et patres), but that holds true not only for the subjects, but also for the prince. The famous passage in 1 Samuel 8, describing wide-ranging powers of kings and used in arguments in favor of absolutism, is thus understood, following Melanchthon and Gerhard, as a description of tyranny.[158] Further, Besold reminded the reader that Christ and the apostles did not proselytize their contemporaries with the help of force, that the church needs to function without weapons, and that superiors must not enforce a belief, not even the Christian faith, on their subjects. He quoted Luther saying that those who had the honor of being Christians were often persecuted for heresy. He underpinned this approach by contending that the law of nature, to which all government is subjected, demanded freedom of conscience and that every subject should believe what he wanted.[159]

Lutheran Monarchomachs?

As mentioned above, a number of scholars, primarily Horst Dreitzel, Wolfgang Sommer, Luise Schorn Schütte, and researchers inspired by her, have unearthed a wealth of material about the rather critical manner in which ministers in town and at court not only openly attacked civil magistrtates but claimed and defended a right to admonish and guide secular authority.[160] Schorn-Schütte in particular has connected the arguments of Lutheran ministers about the Christian body politic and their place as an estate in it[161] with the establishment of the Lutheran clergy as an estate in a new sense, not least because they could have legitimate children that themselves could aspire to a position in the church.[162] The contexts of Lutheran intervention in or even against

[158] Besold, *De Iure Maiestate*, pp. 67–68, 78.

[159] Besold, *De Iure Maiestate*, pp. 119, 129–30, 133: "Die sein nicht Gottes Volk, welche den Namen, Schein und Ehre davon haben. Die sein Gottes Volk die den Namen und Schein haben, dass sie Ketzer, Abtrünnige und des Teufels eigen seyn," p. 132: "Juris naturalis est, conscientiam libere habere & credere quicquid velis".

[160] See *Debatten über die Legitimität*; the main work on court preachers will remain Sommer, *Lutherischen Hofprediger*.

[161] Luise Schorn-Schütte, "Obrigkeitskritik und Widerstandsrecht. Die politica christiana als Legitimationsgrundlage," in *Aspekte der politischen Kommunikation im Europa des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts*, ed. Luise Schorn-Schütte (Munich, 2004), pp. 195–232.

[162] See her massive *Evangelische Geistlichkeit in der Frühneuzeit: deren Anteil an der Entfaltung frühmoderner Staatlichkeit und Gesellschaft: dargestellt am Beispiel des Fürstentums Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel, der Landgrafschaft Hessen-Kassel und der Stadt Braunschweig* (Gütersloh, 1996).

princely policies are manifold and more often than not are connected to a defense of the Lutheran church against real or alleged threats from Calvinism or even Catholicism but also against interventions by civil magistrates in some of the fierce debates among Lutherans throughout the later 16th century.

Beyond this important finding, Horst Dreitzel labeled about a dozen German authors of legal tracts and political treatises (*Politica*) as *monarchomachs*, among them Lutheran legal scholars such as Friedrich Pruckmann, Heinrich Bruning, Valentin Forster, Bartholomaeus Volcmar, and Jakob Multz, Lutheran theologians like Johann Gerhard and Jacob Fabricius,[163] and Lutheran authors of *Politicae* like Reinhard Koenig and Christian Liebenthal. The date of their publications ranges from Mathias Cuno's *De pactis liber* in 1590 to Reinhold Condit's *Repraesentatio majestatis* in 1690.[164] Dreitzel refers to the widespread group of authors in whose tracts references to the emerging imperial and territorial constitutions favored territorial estates or even subjects, to the very point of legitimizing resistance. As the constitutions of empire and territories were, between the 1550s and 1670, in the making rather than set and complete, not only princes but also estates sought to participate in shaping them through innumerable large and small legal suits, supported by their own lawyers. American scholar Michael Benert argued that "Lutheran constitutionalism" in resistance to the emperor during the 1520s to 1550s exemplified John Elliot's view of "Constitutional Nationalism". Elliott had argued that during the 16th century, across Europe, contemporaries developed

> an idealized conception of the various communities to which allegiance was owed; and it embraced, in ever-widening circles, the family and vocational communities to which they belonged, the urban or provincial community in which they lived, and ultimately, and sometimes very hazily, the community of the realm. This idealized conception of the community was compounded of various elements. There was, and most naturally, the sense of kinship and unity with others sharing the same allegiance.

---

[163] Jacob Fabricius, *Einunddreissig Kriegsfragen* (Stettin, 1631); cf. Robert von Friedeburg, *Widerstandsrecht und Konfessionskonflikt. Notwehr und Gemeiner Mann im deutsch-britischen Vergleich 1530–1669* (Berlin, 1999), pp. 90–97.

[164] Horst Dreizel, "Politische Philosophie," in: *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie. Die Philosophie des 17. Jahrhunderts*. Vol. 4: *Das Heilige Römische Reich deutscher Nation. Nord- und Ostmitteleuropa*, ed. Helmut Holzey and Wilhelm Schmidt Biggemann (Basel, 2001), pp. 609–866.

> But there was also a sense of the corporation or community as a legal and historical entity, which had acquired certain distinctive characteristics with the passage of time, together with certain specific obligations, rights and privileges.[165]

Arguably, Lutheran legal scholars and their territorial clientele became committed to shaping constitutional developments in the evolving territories—often by reference to largely fictive *Herkommen*—in order to preserve religion, privileges, and liberties, even against the princes. Under these specific circumstances Lutheranism and constitutionalism became close allies.

Already from 1522/1523, when the issue arose, the Wittenberg theologians had insisted that adherence to the gospel, even if it motivated parts of the population, could not legitimize civil strife, for no one could be a judge in his own case. Moreover, provisions of the law of nature, though the foundation of the civil order, were accessible only *through* the civil order. Retribution and punishment belonged to civil magistrates, the *Wehrstand*, in entire accordance with Luther's insistence that no one can be his own judge.[166] The *Reichslandfrieden*, however, did not outlaw the defense of subjects by their magistrates against the illegal attacks of other magistrates in cases of emergency. Leagues for mutual support remained legal as well, such as the 1524 Catholic *Regensburger Einung*, the 1525 *Dessau* alliance to suppress the peasant uprising and the Lutheran sect, and the 1526 counter-alliance of Gotha-Torgau between John of Saxony, Philip of Hesse, a few other princes, and Magdeburg.

It was only in 1530 that the scope of this legal use of force began to be considered for application against illegal actions by the emperor himself. At this point at least, consideration of constitutional technicalities became the basis for Lutheran arguments regarding resistance. Because the papal ban was understood to be devoid of sufficient authority, the emperor had no right to settle questions of faith that had to be settled by a future council. The majority revocation (1529) of the unilateral decision in the imperial diet (1526) not to enforce the Edict of Worms remained invalid, just as any majority vote in issues of conscience

---

[165] J.H. Elliot, "Revolution and continuity in early modern Europe," *Past & Present* 42 (1969), 48–49, quoted from Richard Benert, "Lutheran resistance theory and the Imperial constitution," *Il Pensiero Politico* 6 (1973), 17–36, p. 35.

[166] Friedeburg, *Self Defense*, pp. 56–90.

were for the "Protestants" protesting against it;[167] an enforcement of the Edict remained equally illegal. This argument was elaborated in a number of memoranda by Luther, Melanchthon, Bugenhagen, Jonas, and others.[168] Since the emperor remained bound by his oath and the imperial constitution to comply with legal procedures, the princes could defend themselves against an illegal attack by appealing to the law of nature and should protect their subjects as faithful magistrates.[169] Since *evangelium non tollit leges*, Luther and Melanchthon submitted to this possibility as prescribed by the civil laws of the empire.

During the 1540s Melanchthon in particular enriched the range of argument by his own extensive use of the concept of the law of nature. Not only were magistrates subject to it; it also proved useful regarding the issue of self-defense. The law of nature began to extend not only to the *politia*, and thus to the institution of magistrates as those governing in it, to marriage and to family, but by 1543 also to distinguishing revenge (*vindicta*) from defense (*defensio*). The former remained the office of magistrates and the monopoly of their estate (*Wehrstand*) in Lutheran three-estate theory, the latter pertained to individuals with a duty to defend members of their household and thus became directly accessible to subjects. The point here is that defense in this sense, as a part of the law of nature, was not dependent on the status or estate of a person, but related to the severity of a threat. Any father or mother was under the obligation to defend children and servants in their household. Even imperial statutary criminal law, the *Carolina*, provided for this possibility, though not by collective action.[170] Thus, this line of argument emphasized examples of mothers protecting their children, men protecting their families.[171] This distinction between *defensio* and *vindicta* allowed self-defense even to groups of subjects against troops. Against illegal or even outrages by soldiers, subjects within and under a civil order *could* now be conceived as having the right to fight, defined as the duty to protect their families through self-defense by law of nature.[172] With the advent of the Smalcald War, one pamphlet argued for this natural

[167] Protest brought against the proposition of the commission of the diet on 19 and 20 April 1529.
[168] Friedeburg, *Widerstandsrecht*.
[169] Friedeburg, *Self Defense*, pp. 56–90.
[170] Friedeburg, *Self Defense*, pp. 75–79.
[171] Friedeburg, *Widerstandsrecht*, pp. 62–63; see the preface by Melanchthon and Bugenhagen to the *Erklärung Martin Luthers die Nothwehr belangend* (Wittenberg, 1547).
[172] CR 21:702–23.

right to self-defense with examples of subjects defending themselves against Spanish soldiers during the capture of Düren, but also by the self-defense of the whole German *patria* against illegal harassment by Spanish soldiers. Both arguments remained clearly distinguished from the privileges of princes or other inferior magistrates to protect their subjects in terms of their *Wehrstand*-function, the 1530 basis for the argument concerning resistance.[173]

The Magdeburg pamphlets of 1549–1551 explained the struggle of the town against an implementation of the Interim as the defense of innocent subjects *by their magistrates* and as self-defense *by the whole Magdeburg community as a fatherland*, but also as an apocalyptic struggle against the Antichrist; Magdeburg appeared as Jerusalem, its inhabitants as the people of Israel.[174] The Magdeburg *Confession*, however, explicitly denied subjects any right to resistance (in the sense of collective armed combat) on their own account. It argued that defense must be exercised according to one's station in life and that any defense that went too far could give Hans-No-Sense the pretext to rebel. Organized armed combat, as the city-magistrate had undertaken during the siege, should only be pursued by those with the office permitting it, that is, by magistrates. The Magdeburg *Confession* thus cited Luther's approach to the three estates in society but emphasized that the distribution of offices among them precluded simple heads of households from engaging collectively in violence without the leadership of magistrates. The Lutheran three-estate approach did thus not then or later permit subjects to resist, as the argument about self-defense had done. The core of the Magdeburg argument, in particular in the Magdeburg *Confession*, was only an extension of the established Lutheran argument about the legality of inferior magistrates defending their subjects and the church against illegal attacks within the civil laws of the empire to urban magistrates with a disputed claim to governing a free city.[175] This legal approach in the Lutheran argument was, via the Magdeburg elaborations, made available beyond the empire by Sleidan and by later German legal his-

---

[173] Friedeburg, *Self Defense*, pp. 56–90; Huschke, *Melanchthons Lehre*, p. 124, stresses that after 1548 and as Melanchthon was developing is *ordo politicus*, he would again refer to these arguments.

[174] Thomas Kaufmann, *Das Ende der Reformation. Magdeburgs "Herrgotts Kanzlei" 1548–1551/2*, (Tübingen, 2003).

[175] See in more detail on the Magdeburg Confession, Robert von Friedeburg, "'Confusion' about the Magdeburg Confession and the Making of 'Revolutionary Early Modern Resistance Theory,'" ARG 97 (2006), 307–18.

tory,[176] and was explicitly cited by Knox and Beza. In its original context its most significant element remained the distinction between gospel and law, church and civil commonwealth, and the allegation that the defense of subjects by lower magistrates and the self-defense of subjects and one's native land against specific actions did not undermine the bonds of allegiance necessary for any civil order.

However, not only in the ensuing conflicts between princes and estates but also in the scholarly literature the emerging territories were thought to bind the supreme magistrate, the prince, to specific legal procedures. An early example of that is of Regius Selinus (Basilius Monnerus).[177] The underlying understanding of relationships between princes and the lower nobility, and sometimes even citizens, as like those between lords and enfeoffed vassals, was never quite entirely pushed to the side by the political terminology of majesty, territorial superiority, and subjecthood. The increasing weight of the assumption of a *ius superioritatis* of the imperial estates over a more or less ill-defined group of subjects and vassals did *shape* the nature of interrelated hierarchies within the empire, but it did not *change* it radically in favor of territorial absolutism. Some major legal scholars, like Tobias Paurmeister, retained the limits to imperial power but insisted that everyone physically in a territory must also be subject to the prince enfeoffed with the principality of this geographical region.[178] These authors did not only hold that the princes should rule according to the written laws, statutes, contracts, and the *Herkommen*, but that specific groups among the subjects and vassals of the prince could enforce princely compliance with the laws. It remained characteristic of these considerations to approach the issue with caution, in particular with regard to single subjects. For example, in 1618, Bartholomaeus Volcmar published his *De Iure Principum aliorumque magistratum synoptica Tractatio*. Chapter IX dealt with the problem the kind of defense that was appropriate against a prince. Like others, he denounced patricide and any illegal action by subjects; he reminded readers that Luther had warned against a war against Charles V. However, Volcmar then reminded his readers using Scripture (1 Kings 12), Bodin, and Althusius

[176] Friedrich Hortleder, *Der Römischen Keyser und königlichen Majestät…Handlungen und Ausschreiben…von Rechtmässigkeit, Anfang und Fortgang des deutschen Kriegs…Vom Jahr 1546 biss auf das Jahr 1558* (Weimar, 1618).

[177] Friedeburg, *Self defense*, pp. 80–83.

[178] Tobias Paurmeister, *De Iurisdictione Imperii romani Libri II* (Hannover, 1608), C VIII, n. 21, 31, 39, pp. 514–58.

that the people had no obligation to a tyrant, whether a usurper devoid of title or a tyrant *ex exercitio*. Lord and vassals were obligated to the *patria* (in this context the typical term for the territory in question).[179] If it exceeded the bounds of legality, the action of princes were seen as null and void (*propterea eius decreta nulla sunt*). Self-defense to preserve life and limb was legitimate, the defense of religion even more so (*multo magis in causa religionis*). The task of correcting and defending lay with the Ephors, quoting a letter from Luther edited by Melanchthon in 1547 and Nehemiah 4. Volcmar also cited the three different kinds of resistance, the allegiance to the *patria*, not the prince, the licit defense of one's life, and the specific privileges of groups in Germany to correct a superior magistrate, that had been developed by the 1620s as types frequently cited,[180] however, without any clear indication who these persons could be. Moreover, some legal scholars argued that the law allowed one to resist the actions of a magistrate where these threatened not only life and limb but also the goods of vassal or subject.[181] Feudal law provided for intervention by the emperor or the right to resist by vassals if they were maltreated, for that meant that the feudal compact had lost its value. Thus, Heinrich Rosenthal still insisted in his *Tractatus synopsis totius iuris feudalis* (1610) that while a vassal might never injure his lord (*laedere personam domini*), he could resist—and so could his own sub-vassals (*sed aliter ei vel eius subsidiaries resistat*)—the illegal actions of his lord. The vassal could, as long as the body of the lord was not injured, confront his lord, in court and otherwise. In the case of the illegal interference of the lord into enfeoffed holdings, even injuring the lord in defense remained legitimate.[182]

Many of these authors, such as Maulius, Wesenbeck, and Rosenthal, were cited by the major authority on the *ius reformandi* to *superioritas territorialis* of the 1620s–1640s, Christoph Besold. Besold cited these as

[179] See Bartholomaeus Volcmar, *De Iure Principum aliorumque magistratum synoptica Tractatio* (Frankfurt/M, 1618), c XI, p 117. For other examples see Robert von Friedeburg, "The Making of Patriots: Love of Fatherland and Negotiating Monarchy in 17th Century Germany," *Journal of Modern History* 77 (2005), 881–916.

[180] Ibid., pp. 117, 118, 123–26. On the gradual development of these three core forms of resistance in the empire between the later 1520s and the 1620s, see Friedeburg, *Self defense*, pp. 56–156.

[181] Heinrich Rosenthal, *Tractatus et synopsis totius Iuris Feudalis* (Cologne 1610), C 10, concl. 20, 58–60, concl. 33, pp. 125–28. See particularly, p. 59. "Vasallo dominum pro defensione sui cum moderamine offendere licit; Magistratum contra ius vim in bonis inferentem, etiam in persona laedere licitum".

[182] Ibid.

examples in favor of the argument that princes could be held accountable to some court of justice.[183] He himself was careful not to spell out how that actually was to be accomplished in matters of general principle, but rather insisted on the factual legal framework for protecting public right and and private goods.

The Peace of Westphalia

While the Edict of Restitution (1629) marked a highpoint in the very real threat of Catholic Counter-Reformation, the Swedish (and later French) entry into the Thirty Years War, and the Peace of Prague in 1635, led to explicit acceptance of the reformation of some of the ecclesiastical institutions by Lutheran princes after 1555. In the negotiations leading to the Peace of Prague and later to the compromises at Osnabruck and Münster, Lutheran insistence on the right of territorial princes to reform provided the main line of defense for the spread of the Lutheran faith. Determining the point in time to mark the extent of this spread, 1612 or 1620, as Lutherans claimed, or 1627, as the emperor preferred, became one of the major stumbling blocks to further negotiations.[184] In 1635 negotiators insisted on 1627 as the decisive year for determining which lands should remain Protestant. During the negotiations after 1644 Lutherans again insisted on the validity of reformation by civil magistates within their territorial sphere of jurisdiction: again, the *ius reformandi* tied to territorial superiority remained the major bulwark of Lutheranism against counter-reformational plans. They asked again to allow subjects at least to follow their conscience in private, even under Catholic princes, and to allow them to visit Lutheran churches in neighboring territories. An anonymous systematic assessment of the *ius reformandi* even stressed that no prince should force anyone into any belief. Given the existing evidence, particularly the treaties of 1552 and 1555, a *ius reformandi* had to be assumed but was to be exercised

[183] Christoph Besold, *De Republica Curanda*, in: *Reipublicae naturam et constitutionem* (Strasbourg, 1626), c IX, "de Republica Curanda," pp. 175–76.

[184] Fritz Dickmann, *Der Westfälische Frieden*, (Münster, 1959), pp. 62–64, 162–82, 380–82, e.g. on the disagreements among France and Sweden on the further future of former Catholic ecclesiastical claims, such as on Magdeburg and Catholic institutions in northwestern Germany. See the summary of the older literature, Bernd Mathias Kremer, "Die Interpretation des Westfälischen Friedens durch die 'Schulen' des Jus Publicum," in *Der Westfälische Friede*, ed. Heinz Duchhardt (Munich, 1998), pp. 757–78.

with restrictions concerning the enforcement of faith.[185] The final basis for the actual peace, the *Instrumentum Pacis Trauttmansdorffianum* then allowed all subjects exercising a faith in 1624 to adhere to that faith, while those who did not should at least receive the right to *exercitium privatum* (*Hausandacht*). Radical Catholics vehemently opposed this suggestion. Again, the intensity of Catholic opposition, particularly of any autonomy for subjects, i.e. in terms of *exercitium privatum*, needs to be taken into consideration when assessing the Lutheran relationship between church and state. The 1624 regulations remained unacceptable to the Habsburgs, whose principalities (*Erblande*) remained excepted from it.[186] In effect, the technical compromise on the *Normaljahr* 1624 guaranteed *exercitium publicum* as exercised then, with the exception of the Habsburg lands. More than that, other subjects were allowed to pursue *exercitium privatum* or to travel to neighboring churches outside their own territory, provided they did not cause public disorder (Article V 34 IPO).[187] A major claim of Besold was thus realized though with strict confinement to the three legally accepted confessions. All subjects adhering to the Augsburg Confession, Calvinists and Lutherans, were guaranteed *conscientiae liberae* (Article VII 1 IPO).[188] Indeed, later 17th-century standard accounts for princes by their advisors, such as Veit Ludwig von Seckendorff, reflected explicitly in his *Teutsche Fürstenstaat* the need for any prince to act within the legal constraints imposed by the empire and the social constraints imposed by the expectations of subjects that must not be alienated.[189]

Diverging paths: Pufendorf and Horn

As mentioned above, the continued insistence of Lutherans on the *ius reformandi* and its connection to *ius territorii* had not least functioned as

[185] Schneider, *Ius Reformandi*, pp. 324–49.
[186] Ibid., 377–83, 387, 391, 394, 398–99.
[187] Ibid., pp. 408–09.
[188] Regarding the dispute between the reformed princes and electoral Saxony on this, see Martin Heckel, "Reichsrecht und Zweite Reformation: Theologisch Juristische Probleme reformierter Konfessionalisierung," in *Reformierte Konfessionalisierung*, pp. 11–43.
[189] See Gerhard Menk, "Der deutsche Territorialstaat in Veit Ludwig von Seckendorffs Werk und Wirken," in *Dynastie und Herrschaftssicherung in der frühen Neuzeit*, ed. Heide Wunder (Berlin, 2002), pp. 55–92. See also Solweig Strauch, *Veit Ludwig von Seckendorff (1626–1692). Reformationsgeschichtsschreibung—Reformation des Lebens—Selbstbestimmung zwischen lutherischer Orthodoxie, Pietismus und Frühaufklärung* (Münster, 2005).

a shelter against Catholic counter-reformational plans and restitution efforts. During the later 17th century, emphasis on the rights of the civil magistrate began to accompany efforts towards further toleration. The view of someone like Samuel Pufendorf of the church as an association complemented the development of broader ideas of toleration, while the confessional absolutism of Horn opposed this. Modern natural law, the rights of rulers, and more religious space for subjects thus went together.[190] At the same time, the 1660s and 1670s in particular saw the emergence of actual theories of absolutism and divine-right monarchy in the empire itself. These were mainly Catholic in origin, but some, such as John Frederick Horn's *Politicorum pars architectonica de civitate* (1664), were Lutheran.[191] Horn understood the civil magistate to be one specific form among other forms of hierarchy, for instance, in the family. Princes receive their majesty directly from God; social life (the *civitas*) is entirely dependent on rule in order to give it form (*res publica*). A number of rather banal assumptions in the more prevalent legal and political thought of the empire, for instance, by Besold, such as the distinction between *maiestas personalis* and *maiestas realis* (majesty as exercised by the monarch and majesty as exercised by the *civitas* as such), were inconceivable to Horn.[192] Hints like those of Besold or Gerhard on the frequently legally restricted nature of princely rule, the possible rights of estates, and the implications of legal limitations on the nature of rule, of prosecution, etc., had no place in his design. Horn, particularly his conception of the "organic rise of the *civitas* from simple families," was sharply attacked by Thomas Hobbes, who insisted on the artificiality of the more formal organisation of human life in the state. He ridiculed the metaphor of matter and form and insisted on the voluntary act of individuals to form the state.[193] Pufendorf also insisted on the fundamentally different aims of state and

[190] See Asch, "No Bishop," p. 119.

[191] Heinrich De Wall, *Die Staatslehre John Frederick Horns (ca. 1629–1665)*, (Aalen, 1992) concisely describes why German Protestant Aristotelianism, even if stressing the value and prevalence of absolute rule, did not argue with divine rights. These were empirically difficult to find in the empire, that was holy as a whole, but did not have princes like in France or England endowed with the Royal Touch. Henning Arnisaeus' account of political power simply empirically states that it rests on either conquest, inheritance, or some treaty, and has hardly any place for a specific divine founding. Friedeburg/Seidler, "Germany I," thus the civil character of these ideas.

[192] Ibid., pp. 56, 108–109, 214–15, 198–99, on the considerable problems that Horn had to overcome in order to assess the existence of limited monarchies.

[193] Ibid., pp. 60–62.

church, i.e., security and salvation, and thus clearly abandoned the Constantinian vision of the *polis* church. Moreover, he saw churches as voluntary associations within the state. They may have their own rules but must not challenge the state.[194] While Pufendorf advised the prince to see to it that pure religion is taught and warned against the potential danger of citizens having religious and thus also political loyalties beyond those to their own government,[195] he condemned the prosecution of heretics and insisted, like Besold, that *exercitium privatum* must be left to those who do not wish to attend public worship. While the duties of the individual toward God were clearly distinguished from the duties of the individual toward other human beings, Pufendorf did take into account the possibility that allegiance to a specific faith could have consquences in undermining the civil order in a given state. He insisted on the maintenance of security in that order. He did not think rulers should impose their faith on society but did favor some common religion in the state.[196]

Conclusion

In 1956/1957 both Martin Heckel and Leonard Krieger published their visions of the relationship between church and civil magistrate, conscience, and politics, a detailed investigation of Latin scholarly argument the one, a broad and wide ranging essay on mentality and politics the other. In general, the development of a nonconfessional—or not solely confessional—ecclesiastical law within the empire, protecting the heretic—in the other confession's eye—from prosecution, has been Heckel's major claim.[197] Krieger, in contrast, like much English-speaking research, tended not to take the empire seriously as a political

[194] Michael J. Seidler, "Pufendorf and the Politics of Recognition," in *Natural Law and Civil Sovereignty. Moral Right and State Authority in Early Modern Political Thought*, eds. Ian Hunter, David Saunders (Basingstoke, 2002), pp. 235–251.

[195] See Samuel Pufendorf, *The Whole Duty of Man, According to the Law of Nature* (1673), ed. Ian Hunter and David Saunders (Indianapolis, 2003), p. 216; cf. particularly Irene Dingel, "Recht und Konfession bei Samuel Pufendorf," in *Recht–Macht–Konfession*, ed. Joachim Mehlhausen (Gütersloh, 1998), pp. 516–40.

[196] See Michael Seidler, "The Politics of Self-Preservation: Toleration and Identity in Pufendorf and Locke," in *Early Modern Law Theories. Contexts and Strategies in the Early Enlightenment*, ed. T.J. Hochstrasser and P. Schroeder (Dordrecht, 2003), pp. 227–56, 230–31.

[197] Heckel, "Staat und Kirche," pp. 73, 199.

unit and thus portrayed the relation between church and civil magistrate within the emerging territories as plain patrimonial absolutism, where believers were subjected to state control and freedom of conscience was marginalized to a worthless and non-political inner sphere.[198]

On the whole, research in the last twenty years has supported Heckel and his insights rather than Krieger. The empire remained crucially important for the developments within the territories, and while neither Heckel nor Honecker at any point overestimate the place of diverging religious beliefs within Lutheran assessments of church and state,[199] Honecker rightly points out that neither Gerhard's thought nor the practice of the church order which he wrote for Duke Casimir reflect unrestricted patrimonial control of the church. In the meantime, the research of Horst Dreitzel in particular on Besold has instead underscored the broad argument, particularly among Lutheran lawyers, for preserving public order, but allowing *exercitium privatum* to other faiths and not coercing faith. Given the wide range in German political thought, these arguments were very different from the very real ideas on absolutism of some Lutheran political scientists, like Henning Arnisaeus, of authors such as Horn, or of Catholic authors.[200] The Lutheran distinction of law and gospel and its insistence on the *Unverfügbarkeit des Glaubens* (despite all the importance given to the example of Constantine), the alliance of Lutheran lawyers and estates in their struggles against princes, in Hesse as in Brandenburg, the productive use of three-estate theory, and the enormous importance of positive constitutional law for political argument in the decentralized multi-dynastic system of the empire contributed to bring about this curious development.

For some time to come, given the enormous amount of unresearched material, detailed monographs will be more important tools for understanding the relationship of church and civil magistrates and its implications than will essays like that of Krieger. The crucial importance of the Latin scholarly literature for social life and social conflict is coming to light as social and legal historians together discover the everyday court battles in which petty territorial nobles and their subjects "negotiated" in law the actual room for maneuver between prince and subjects. We are

[198] Leonard Krieger, *The German idea of Freedom* (Chicago, 1972).
[199] See Heckel, "Staat und Kirche," pp. 74, 203–04.
[200] See Friedeburg, "Cuius regio".

only at the beginning of a systematic tapping of this source.[201] English translations of core works such as those of Heckel and Honecker, but also of works on imperial history such as those of Luttenberger and Lanzinner, would be enormously helpful to create, again, a common background for further research.

[201] Robert von Friedeburg, "The Making of Patriots: Love of Fatherland and Negotiating Monarchy in 17th Century Germany," *Journal of Modern History* 77 (2005), 881–916, idem, "Why did 17th century estates address the jurisdictions of their princes as fatherlands? War, territorial absolutism and the duties of patriots in 17th century German political discourse," in *Orthodoxies and Heterodoxies in German-Speaking Lands: Religion, Politics and Culture 1500–1700* eds. Randolph C. Head and Daniel Christensen (Leiden, 2007), 169–196.

NORDIC AND BALTIC LUTHERANISM

Eric Lund

In the early modern period the far north of Europe was divided into three political regions. The Union of Kalmar, which combined the kingdoms of Denmark, Norway, and Sweden in 1397, broke apart in 1520 after a rebellion in Sweden. Henceforth, Denmark dominated the west, eventually reducing the territories of Norway and Iceland to the status of provinces. Sweden controlled eastern Scandinavia, including Finland, most of which had come under its control in the 13th century. The Baltic peoples living in the coastal areas south of Finland had been conquered during the Middle Ages by German colonizers and were ruled by the Livonian Order and the Teutonic Knights until the 16th century when these religious administrations were secularized. The resultant dissolution of the confederation of Livonia incited a long struggle between Sweden, Poland, Russia, and Denmark for control of the eastern Baltic territories. Further south, a Lithuanian state had formed during the 13th century, but, after 1569, it existed as a grand duchy in union with the kingdom of Poland.

As a result of extensive interactions with Germany, Lutheranism spread to all of these territories within a few years after the start of the Reformation. Many coastal market towns were interconnected by the Hanseatic League, and itinerant Lutheran preachers found an entry into the north through contacts with the resident German merchant population. Even more importantly, numerous scholars returned to their Scandinavian and Livonian homelands, particularly after studies in Wittenberg, with a commitment to the reform proposals initiated by Luther. They were able to disseminate evangelical ideas and influence governmental policies when they took up positions within churches and schools.

Developments in Germany continued to influence Scandinavian and Baltic Lutheranism throughout the 16th and 17th centuries, but the evolution of religious life and the formation of ecclesiastical institutions were also shaped in distinctive ways by social dynamics and political forces that were peculiar to each of the northern regions. Lutheran sympathizers forged their own paths in the development of policies

for church administration and adapted their theological message to the local settings in which they worked.

In Germany the death of Martin Luther in 1546 and the subsequent Smalcald War marked the start of a new stage in the development of the Lutheran Reformation. In the far north of Europe the following decade was also a period of transition. In 1550 the last major effort to extinguish the Lutheran movement in Iceland failed when Jón Arason, the Catholic bishop of Hólar, was captured and beheaded after attempting to oust Martein Einarsson, the Lutheran bishop in the southern diocese of Skálholt. In 1552 Olaus Petri, the Wittenberg-educated reformer who introduced Lutheranism to Sweden, came to the end of his life. In 1557 Michael Agricola, the schoolmaster and bishop who played a similar pioneering role in Finland, died. Beginning in 1558, Denmark and Sweden made their first territorial conquests in the Baltic region of Livonia, thereby adding strength to the Lutheran movement in the territories of Estonia and Latvia. 1559 marked the end of the reign of Christian III, the first king of Denmark to decree that all of his subjects would become Lutherans. A year later, in 1560, Gustav Vasa, the king who had separated the church of Sweden from papal control, died, as did Peder Palladius, one of the most influential early Lutheran bishops in Denmark. 1561 was the death year of Hans Tausen, the former monk, also educated in Wittenberg, who first stimulated grass-root support for Lutheranism in northern Denmark.[1] An era had come to an end. During this period the three regions of the north continuously interacted with each other, but in order to avoid confusion in the recounting of the continually developing story, this overview will look successively at the interplay of politics and religion in Denmark, Sweden, and the Baltic states.

[1] For a concise introduction to the Scandinavian Reformation, see Bob Scribner, Roy Porter, and Mikuláš Teich, *The Reformation in National Context* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 111–30; See also Bo Reicke, "Die lutherische Reformation in Dänemark-Norwegen und Schweden-Finnland," *Theologische Zeitschrift* 39 (1983), 294–307; David Kirby, *Northern Europe in the Early Modern Period—The Baltic World 1492–1772* (London, 1990), pp. 81–96; Simo Heininen and Markku Heikkilä, *Kirchengeschichte Finnlands*, trans. Matthias Quaschning-Kirsch (Göttingen, 2002), pp. 56–119, Leonid Arbusow, Jr., *Die Einführung der Reformation in Liv-, Est- und Kurland* (Aalen, 1921/1964).

The Early Reformation in Denmark

The so-called Stockholm Bloodbath of 1520 was a momentous turning point for the kingdom of Sweden and for Denmark as well. Christian II, king of Denmark, invaded Sweden and executed eighty Swedish nobles as part of his larger efforts to limit the power of the aristocracy and the clergy within the Kalmar Union. This provoked the rebellion by Gustav Vasa that led to the creation of a separate Swedish kingdom. Soon thereafter, in 1523, a revolt of nobles and bishops in Denmark ended in the deposing of the king by the Royal Council (*Rigsråd*). Christian II was succeeded by his uncle, Frederik I, who as duke of Schleswig-Holstein, had been disinclined to suppress the advance of new religious ideas northward from Wittenberg. After he was elected as king, Lutheranism gained some popular support among the Danish people in Jutland, and Frederik I even appointed Hans Tausen, the prime instigator of that movement, as his personal chaplain. At meetings of the National Assembly (*Rigsdag*) in 1526 and 1527, the king put an end to papal involvement in the appointment of Danish church leaders. This, in turn, allowed for the advancement of Lutheranism in other centers such as Malmø, which at that time was in Danish territory.[2]

Conflicts between traditional Catholics and Protestant reformers continued for some time, prompting the Council to postpone the election of a new king after Frederik I died in 1533, but, when the remaining Catholic bishops attempted to exile Hans Tausen and outlaw Lutheran preachers in 1534, a popular revolt, the Count's War, broke out. To end the civil war, which was further complicated by tensions between noble landowners and the merchants of the cities and by the intervention of the city of Lübeck, the Council eventually offered the throne to Christian III, Frederik's son, who was a deeply committed Lutheran. He wasted no time in setting the religious course for the future by issuing a royal manifesto requiring that all his subjects in Denmark, Norway and Iceland accept the Lutheran understanding of Christianity.[3] The General Recess of 1536, confirmed by the *Rigsdag* meeting in Copenhagen, placed all church properties under the control

[2] Ole Peter Grell, "The City of Malmø and the Danish Reformation," *ARG* 79 (1988), 311–39.

[3] Martin Schwarz Lausten, *A Church History of Denmark*, trans. Frederick Cryer (Aldershot, 2002), pp. 94–106.

of the king and permanently excluded the bishops from a place on the Council. Christian III also set up a commission to create a new church ordinance. The king, who corresponded regularly with Luther and the other reformers in Wittenberg, invited Johannes Bugenhagen to come to Denmark to draft new guidelines for worship and church administration. When the Diet of Odense approved the ordinance in 1539, Bugenhagen presided over the installation of seven new Lutheran bishops. Since he was not a bishop himself, this ended apostolic succession for the leadership of the Danish church.[4]

By the time Christian III died in 1559, the orientation of the church in Denmark had been quite decisively altered. Former Catholic priests continued to serve in many parishes, but clergy trained in Wittenberg, such as Peder Palladius, occupied the most important bishoprics. Lutheran theologians were now teaching at the University of Copenhagen,[5] and Latin schools under the supervision of the church were being established in most townships. Pastors conducted church services in the vernacular language, regularly preached sermons and were required by law to explicate Luther's catechism to their parishioners.[6] For all his commitment to Lutheranism, however, the king was very cautious about involving himself in the religious struggles between Protestants and Catholics that raged on the continent during the later years of his reign. In fact, he withdrew from the Smalcald League in 1544 and made peaceful overtures to Emperor Charles V with hopes that his line, rather than the heirs of King Christian II, would be recognized abroad as the rightful rulers of Denmark. The new king, his son Frederik II, would change his father's policies quite dramatically.

King Frederik II's Involvement in Continental Conflicts

Frederik II, who was temperamentally less cautious than his father, embarked on a more aggressive foreign policy soon after his coronation.

---

[4] Jorgen Stenbaek, "Den danske kirekeordinans af 1537/39—Teologi og function," in Carl-Gustaf Andrén, *Reformationen i Norden* (Lund, 1973), pp. 130–55. See translations of key documents in *Documents Illustrative of the Continental Reformation*, ed. B.J. Kidd (Oxford, 1911/1967).

[5] On the development of Danish clergy under the aegis of Palladius' brother, see Jürgen Beyer, "Bischof Niels Palladius und das Selbstverständnis lutherischer Pastoren um die Mitte des 16. Jahrhunderts," *Schriften des Vereins für Schleswig-Holsteinische Kirchengeschichte*, 2. ser. 45 (1992), 25–41.

[6] Leif Grane, "Teaching the People. The Education of the Clergy and the Instruction of the People in the Danish Reformation Church," in *Reformationstudien* (Mainz, 1999), pp. 157–77.

He was determined not only to maintain Denmark's prominence in the north but also to expand its influence among the Protestant states on the continent. In 1559 he extended Danish territory southward by conquering Dithmarschen, a previously independent region along the coast of Holstein. Four years later he entered into the Nordic Seven Years War, thereby commencing a rivalry with Sweden that would endure for the next century. This conflict temporarily strained the Danish economy, but after the kingdom recovered, the reign of Frederik II became, overall, a period of significant prosperity and cultural advancement.

Frederik II's older sister Anna married August, elector of Saxony in 1548, and he became a close friend of this prominent leader of continental Lutherans. He traveled in Germany prior to his coronation, at which time he met many other Protestant princes. These relationships prompted him to reverse his father's isolationist tendencies. Over a period of years he involved himself in efforts to promote solidarity among a wide range of Protestants. At one point August of Saxony even advocated the promotion of the Danish king as a candidate for election as Holy Roman Emperor since his position as duke of Schleswig and Holstein made him eligible for consideration.[7] Frederik II was prompted to be even more assertive on behalf of the wider Protestant cause after the St. Bartholomew's Day massacre of Huguenots in France in 1572. He became fearful of the formation of an international Catholic conspiracy and made repeated efforts to create a more effective union among all Protestant states, both Lutheran and Calvinist. Although commercial disputes resulting from Denmark's control of the straits into the Baltic Sea complicated relationships between the allies, numerous Protestant rulers had hopes that Frederik II would intervene directly in later religious conflicts such as the Cologne war, which took place in 1583 after the conversion of the Catholic archbishop of that diocese to Protestantism. In the end, however, the Danish king was not willing to make such a commitment. He hoped that a passive, defensive alliance of Protestant states would be sufficient to repel Catholic threats. As a result, Denmark ultimately played a rather limited role in western European political life in the late 16th century although it raised its profile as a regional power.[8]

---

[7] Paul Douglas Lockhart, *Frederik II and the Protestant Cause. Denmark's Role in the Wars of Religion, 1559–1596* (Leiden, 2004), pp. 29–55, 83–100.

[8] Lockhart, *Frederik II*, pp. 104–42, 174–89, 202–19.

Consolidation of the Reformation in Danish Territories

There has been a longstanding debate about why Frederik II got involved in continental disputes. The most recent scholarship has tended to argue that religious and political motivations cannot easily be separated from each other in the 16th century. Frederik II may not have manifested the intense piety of his father, but he was clearly anti-Catholic and interested in religious issues. In addition to cooperating with Protestant rulers in Germany, he continued the reform process that had already been introduced in the Danish church.[9]

Christian III had taken several forceful steps to promote the Reformation in his realm, but the eradication of many traditional ways of thought and practice was still a lengthy process. There continued to be a shortage of well-trained Lutheran clergy at the beginning of Frederik II's reign. A Danish translation of the Bible was available after 1550, but not every church possessed a copy of it. Liturgical practices were far from uniform throughout the realm. Features associated with Catholic piety, such as side altars, had not been removed from all churches. Visitation reports indicated that the veneration of saints and the visiting of holy shrines continued to be common.[10]

This was particularly true in the more distant regions of Norway and Iceland where there had been little evidence of a spiritual struggle going on among the people to prepare the way for the Reformation. Norway produced no important native reformer during the early 16th century, and there was widespread popular support for the deposed king, Christian II, when he came to Norway in 1531 to launch an effort to regain the Danish throne from his Protestant uncle. The Reformation in Norway came about by imposition from outside although the new Lutheran bishops that Christian III gradually appointed between 1537 and 1546 were mostly Norwegians and not Danes. This was not the case in the following period when Danish church leaders were generally sent northward to govern the Norwegian church.[11] Norway remained

[9] Ibid., pp. 4–8, 320–22.

[10] Grethe Jacobsen, "Nordic Women and the Reformation," in *Women in Reformation and Counter-Reformation Europe*, ed. Sherrin Marshall (Bloomington, 1989), pp. 50, 58–61.

[11] Ingun Montgomery, "A Reformation without Reformer. The Realization of the Reformation in Norway," in *Church and People in Britain and Scandinavia*, ed. Ingmar Brohed (Lund, 1996), pp. 147–57. For a wider review of interpretations of the Norwegian Reformation, see K.E. Christopherson, "Hallelujahs, Damnations, or Norway's Reformation as Lengthy Process," *CH* 48 (1979), 279–89.

subject to the Danish Church Ordinance of 1537/39 until 1607 when it finally got a Church Ordinance of its own.

In Iceland Gissur Einarsson was consecrated as the first Lutheran bishop for the southern diocese of Skáholt in 1542, but the northern diocese of Hólar was not freed from Catholic control until the appointment of Olaf Hjaltason in 1552. Although there was no widespread resistance to the changes introduced by new leadership, the mentality of the people was not deeply altered for sometime after that conflicted period.[12]

During the reign of Christian III the first Lutheran bishops played an important role in advising the king about the implementation of reforms. His successor took a more direct hand in the further consolidation of this process. Soon after he came to power, Frederik II called for the drafting of a new church ordinance in 1561. The document was prepared, but for complicated reasons it was never formally authorized. While the Ordinance of 1537/39 remained in effect, the king pursued efforts to gain greater control over religious life by enacting clearer laws about matters such as how worship services would be conducted throughout the kingdom. In 1568 the liturgy used at the Church of Our Lady (*Vor Frue Kirke*) in Copenhagen became the model for all parishes. In 1569 and again in 1580 Frederik II commanded the printing of standard altar books, prepared by bishops Peder Palladius and Poul Madsen. No detail escaped the king's attention. He ordered pastors to determine how many parishioners would be communing and to adjust the amount of bread and wine that was consecrated to that number. In 1580 a royal edict required that the primary Sunday service begin at 8 a.m. and end at 10 a.m. Around the same time stricter enforcement of separate seating for men and women went into effect.[13]

The king created a careful structure for the dissemination of royal decrees related to religion. His polices were communicated to the bishops, who passed them on to the lower clergy at diocesan synods. He required bishops to conduct regular visitations and to meet with pastors at general assemblies called *landemode*. This structure, however, did not preclude the king's direct involvement at times in local affairs. There were cases where he intervened to dismiss particular clergy for dissolute behavior or for liturgical irregularities. Occasionally he stepped

[12] John Hood, *Icelandic Church Saga* (London, 1946), pp. 42–159. See also Carl Wisløff. *Norsk Kirkehistorie Vol. I* (Oslo, 1966), pp. 419–21.

[13] Lockart, *Frederik II*, pp. 67–69.

in to enforce the payment of required tithes or to rescue pastors who were being pressured to marry their predecessor's widow as a condition for assuming a new post. In addition to upholding higher moral standards for the clergy, Frederik II introduced stricter expectations for their education. Royal funds improved Latin schools throughout the kingdom, and more scholarships were provided for studies at the University of Copenhagen or abroad.

During the reign of Frederik II the church became an important institution not only for the promotion of greater regulation of morality in society but also for the enhancement of the power of the monarchy. The king looked to the clergy as a tool for the elimination of social problems such as vagrancy, prostitution, drunkenness, and disrespect for authority. He continued a practice initiated by Christian III: the designating of special prayer-days on which parishioners were required to attend services at which issues of special interest to the king were addressed and prayers were spoken in support of royal policies.

The Melanchthonian Era in Denmark-Norway

Frederik II had precise aspirations for the shaping of social life and church administration, but he was much less particular about the theological stance of the church. During his reign Germany was beset by rampant factionalism, as theologians divided into Philippist and Gnesio-Lutheran parties. Frederik II showed little interest in the issues those theologians discussed and tried to keep their debates from spreading to Denmark. Primarily to prevent the formation of divisions within the church, he kept tight control over the publication of books and ordered the clergy to refrain from preaching about controversial theological issues that might confuse simple believers. This has been called "a policy of enforced non-controversy," in some respects similar to the pragmatic stance advocated by his contemporary, Queen Elizabeth I in England.[14] As long as a position was in line with the Augsburg Confession and did not stir up disunity in his kingdom, he was quite willing to tolerate it. Similarly, in his foreign policy he valued Protestant unity over theological precision.

In so far as his personal leanings can be determined, Frederik II seemed to have had Philippist sympathies. Generally speaking, this posi-

[14] Ibid., pp. 74–83.

tion remained dominant within the Danish church longer than was the case in continental Lutheranism. The explanations for this outlook are multiple. Prior to the development of royal support for the Reformation, the tradition of Christian humanism was well established among Danish intellectuals. The most influential humanist was a Carmelite friar named Paulus Helie (Poul Helgesen), who held a lectureship in theology at the University of Copenhagen. Like Erasmus, he could be quite critical of the Catholic church but hoped to reform it from within.[15] The humanist tradition was reinforced further by the return to Denmark of many students who had studied with Philip Melanchthon in Wittenberg. When Christian III came to power, he called for an extensive restructuring of education in Denmark that distinctly followed the model Melanchthon had proposed for universities and school. He appointed these students of Melanchthon as the first Lutheran bishops (though for most of this period this office was renamed "superintendent," as was also the case in many of the German territorial churches).

The period from 1560 to 1600, the era of Frederik II, has been called the flowering time of Danish humanism.[16] There were not only many prominent humanists teaching philosophy or other subjects at the university; the upper clergy in general were almost exclusively Philippist in their orientation.[17] The king surrounded himself with court chaplains such as Anders Sørensen Vedel, a noted poet and historian who was decidedly Melanchthonian in his orientation. Frederik II did not keep up a regular correspondence with Melanchthon and Georg Major, as had his father, but he provided them both with an annual pension.

During this period Denmark produced a theologian of international reputation who became controversial for his Philippist leanings. Niels Hemmingsen had been strongly influenced by Melanchthon during his studies in Wittenberg from 1537 to 1543. When he returned to Denmark, he served at the University of Copenhagen successively as professor of Greek, dialectic, and then theology. He was frequently called upon by the kings to offer assistance in the drafting of royal documents related to religious life. Already during the reign of Christian III he

[15] Martin Schwarz Lausten, "The Early Reformation in Denmark and Norway 1520–1559," in *The Scandinavian Reformation*, ed. Ole Peter Grell (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 16–18.

[16] Leif Grane, "Späthumanismus in Dänemark. Strömungen neben dem Melanchthonschen Unterrichtssystem im letzten Teil des 16. Jahrhunderts," in *Reformationstudien*, pp. 227–40.

[17] Lockhart, *Frederik II*, pp. 75–76.

played a major role in the preparation of the first Danish translation of the Bible. Under Frederik II he almost certainly had a hand in the preparation of the proposed Church Ordinance of 1561 and also of the Foreigner Articles of 1569, an effort to limit the spread of religious ideas that might disrupt the social order. Prompted by an influx of Dutch refugees, some of whom were Anabaptists or Calvinists, this law required all resident aliens to declare their acceptance of the Augsburg Confession. Although restrictive, it did not address the more subtle issues related to the mode of Christ's presence in the Lord's Supper that were being debated by continental Lutherans. It offered what has been called a "moderately Melanchthonian" interpretation of the Confession.[18]

Hemmingsen's theological writings were wide-ranging. In 1561 he published a homiletical textbook that stressed the importance of exegetical preaching.[19] In the next year he completed a book on pastoral theology that was influential for many decades. While teaching theology at the university, he also prepared handbooks on dogmatics and ethics. Since they were written in Latin, they were accessible to Lutherans beyond the borders of Denmark. In his *Enchiridion theologicum* of 1555, he displayed a strong attachment to the theological method introduced by Melanchthon's *Loci communes*. His Philippist sympathies became even more apparent in the 1570s when his writings began to criticize theological views defended by Gnesio-Lutherans, especially on the Lord's Supper. In his *Demonstratio*, he attacked the use of the concept of ubiquity to explain Christ's presence in the Lord's Supper. In 1574 he issued the *Syntagma*, a collection of disputational theses that seemed to be even more explicitly Calvinistic in its eucharistic stance.[20]

The book initially caused little controversy in Denmark, but when it was appealed to by some "Crypto-Calvinistic" Philippists in Dresden, August of Saxony decided to bring it to the attention of Frederik II and to demand that Hemmingsen's viewpoint be suppressed. Since the elector was his brother-in-law and close friend, the Danish king

---

[18] Thorkild Lyby and Ole Peter Grell, "The consolidation of Lutheranism in Denmark and Norway," in Grell, *Scandinavian Reformation*, pp. 117–20.

[19] Jens Chr. V. Johansen, "Preacher and Audience: Scandinavia," in *Preachers and People in the Reformation and Early Modern Period*, ed. Larissa Taylor (Leiden, 2001), pp. 56, 313–16.

[20] Munch Madsen, "Om forholdet mellem Niels Hemmingsens 'Enchiridion theologicum' og Melanchthons 'Loci communes,'" *Dansk Teologisk Tidsskrift* 5 (1942), 137–51. See also Lyby and Grell, "Consolidation," pp. 120–21 and Kjell Barnekow, *Niels Hemmingsens Teologiske Åskådning: En Dogmhistorisk Studie* (Lund, 1940).

authorized an investigation. In June 1575 the theological faculty of the University of Copenhagen and all the clergy of that city met to discuss the indictment coming out of Saxony. Although Hemmingsen initially displayed a reluctance to rewrite the controversial passages of his book, he gave in to the king's wishes and signed a declaration stating that he would not teach anything about the Lord's Supper that was in contradiction to the Augsburg Confession. When the elector of Saxony continued to press for a more serious rebuke, Frederik II summoned the theological faculty for five more weeks of meetings in 1576, after which Hemmingsen signed a recantation. The international controversy revived in 1578 when a new edition of the *Syntagma* was published in the Calvinist center of Geneva. In order to pacify the Lutheran princes on the continent, Frederik II felt compelled to suspend Hemmingsen from his university position in July 1579. This action, however, did not signal an end to Philippism in Denmark. Hemmingsen was released with a generous stipend and offered an alternative post as canon at the cathedral in Roskilde. Other committed Philippists at the university and the court remained unaffected, and the king appointed disciples of Hemmingsen to key positions in the church.[21]

Further evidence of the different theological climate in Denmark can be seen in Frederik II's response to the Formula of Concord, which was being composed and circulated for acceptance during the period of the Hemmingsen controversy. On the continent the new, more detailed, confession was seen as a way to unite the Lutheran movement after almost thirty years of theological discord. To the king, however, its theological precision seemed to invite further debate and disharmony. In addition to this concern for domestic tranquility, Frederik II increasingly expressed fears about the international repercussions of the document. Its clear repudiation of Calvinism appeared to be counter-productive to the formation of a broad alliance among Protestants, which he considered essential for the maintenance of a strong front again the advance of Catholicism. At the very time the document was being finalized, Queen Elizabeth I of England was renewing efforts to create a Protestant League on the continent. She appealed to the Danish king for assistance, and his own view was reinforced by her opposition to the Formula of Concord. In 1580 Frederik II issued an

[21] *Den Danske Kirkes Historie*, ed. Hal Koch and Bjørn Kornerup IV (Copenhagen, 1959), pp. 138–47. Lockhart, *Frederik II*, pp. 159–63.

edict prohibiting anyone in Denmark from importing, selling, or even possessing a copy of the Book of Concord. When his sister sent him specially prepared copies in 1581, the king reputedly tossed the books into a fire. He remained opposed throughout his reign, and the Formula of Concord never became an official confession for the Lutheran church of Denmark.[22]

At this time a similar spirit prevailed in Norway. Although other bishops such as Jens Skielderup, Anders Foss, and Jens Nilsson made important contributions to the consolidation of Lutheranism, the most notable Norwegian church leader during the reign of Frederik II was Jørgen Erikssøn. Born in Denmark, Erikssøn was serving as rector of the Latin school in Bergen at the start of Frederik II's reign. After studying in Copenhagen and then in Wittenberg from 1568 to 1570, he married the daughter of the bishop of Bergen and was called himself, in 1571, to be bishop of Stavanger. Working in conjunction with the diocesan synod, Erikssøn introduced reformed practices to a region that had still been scarcely affected by the Reformation. He abolished funeral customs that were rooted in ancient folk tradition and altered the way the sacraments were celebrated. In particular, he ended the elevation of the cup and the ringing of a bell at the time of consecration.[23]

Erikssøn has sometimes been called the Luther of Norway for his energetic work on behalf of church reform. Theologically, however, his views stood closer to those of Melanchthon. Among his early writings, circulated from Denmark (because Norway had no printing press until 1643), was a translation of some of Niels Hemmingsen's Latin writings. His most important work was a series of sermons on the book of Jonah, published in 1592. The influence of a commentary by Johannes Brenz can be seen in the format of Erikssøn's text, but in his view of the law and the role of the human will, he manifested a moralizing emphasis that was more pronounced among many Philippists of this era.[24]

Iceland was untouched by the controversies between Philippists and Gnesio-Lutheran. The island province did produce its share of scholarly church leaders, and they made great strides in the transformation of parish life. The most notable figures from this region were

---

[22] Ibid., pp. 163–74.

[23] Wisløff, *Kirkehistorie*, pp. 444–51.

[24] John Quam, "The Theology of the Norwegian Reformer Jørgen Erikssøn," *LQ* 11 (1997), 169–187. See also, idem, "Jørgen Erikssøn—A Study in the Norwegian Reformation 1571–1604" (Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 1968), pp. 146–213.

Gisli Jónsson who served as bishop of Skálholt for almost thirty years (1558–1587) and Gudbrand Thorlaksson, bishop of Hólar for fifty-six years (1570–1627), who completed the translation work that had been started by his predecessor, Oddur Gottskalksson, and published the first Bible in Icelandic in 1584.[25]

Christian IV and the Battle for Orthodoxy

When Frederik II died in 1588, his son was only eleven years old, necessitating governance by regents for the next eight years. After Christian IV was crowned in 1596, he augmented his father's efforts to make Denmark influential internationally and also devoted much energy to expanding Danish commercial power through fuller control of Baltic trade. These assertive tendencies led him to create an enlarged military and to enter into wars with Sweden and in Germany that would ultimately weaken Danish power. With regard to domestic affairs Christian IV introduced some important changes that moved Denmark in the direction of absolutism. During his reign, the Council met less frequently, and the annual meeting of a parliament (*Herredag*) was suspended altogether. The religious climate in Denmark also changed dramatically.

Christian IV had received a solid education in the Lutheran faith and professed a lifelong commitment to the well-being of the church. He introduced as his motto, "*Regna firmat pietas*" ("piety strengthens the kingdoms"). There is some evidence to suggest that he initially had Philippist leanings, like his father, but during his reign he condoned the development of a new trend within the church towards the kind of orthodoxy that had come to dominate in the Lutheran territories in Germany. Stricter definition of doctrine and practice established greater uniformity in religious life, and this presumably served his interest in solidifying and expanding royal power in Denmark.[26]

Developments in the church during Christian IV's reign were strongly influenced by the leading churchman of that day, Hans Poulsen Resen. Although he came from a humble background in the most remote region of Jutland, he was able to study at the universities in Rostock

[25] Hood, *Church Saga*, pp. 156–64.

[26] Paul Douglas Lockhart. *Denmark in the Thirty Years War, 1618–1648—King Christian IV and the Decline of the Oldenburg State* (Selinsgrove, PA, 1996), pp. 57–68; Lyby and Grell, "Consolidation," pp. 126–28.

and Wittenberg, as well as Copenhagen. During his student years he also traveled in Italy and visited Geneva. In 1591 he became professor of dialectic in the philosophical faculty at the University of Copenhagen. In 1597 he received his doctorate from the theological faculty and began to teach there upon the recommendation of the royal chancellor, Christian Friis til Borreby. Shortly thereafter, in 1604, Resen escorted the king on a visit to England for meetings with King James I. In this same period the king commissioned Resen with the task of conducting a major overhaul of the educational system in Denmark in order to counter-act the appeal of foreign Jesuit academies. Among Resen's other accomplishments were the preparation, in 1607, of a new Danish Bible, translated from Hebrew and Greek instead of Luther's German, and, a year later, an important Danish translation of Luther's Small Catechism.[27]

Over the course of these years Resen's own views appear to have evolved away from an initial sympathy for Philippism and at the same time towards a firm rejection of both Roman Catholicism and Calvinism. As his convictions solidified, he became involved in a series of controversies that revealed his growing commitment to Lutheran Orthodoxy. Although the rite of exorcism at the time of baptism had not been abolished in Denmark, many clergy associated with Niels Hemmingsen had expressed dissatisfaction with it. King Christian IV also seemed inclined to favor the omission of this practice but called for a review of the issue by the bishops and leading theologians. Resen became the most outspoken advocate of its retention and was persuasive enough to insure its preservation in the Danish baptismal liturgy. The exorcism debate, however, created divisions within the university theological faculty, which led to more extensive controversies. Resen was able to achieve the dismissal of colleagues who disagreed with him such as Jørgen Dybvad and Iver Stub. He worked to remove several notable Norwegians working in Copenhagen who also showed signs of sympathy for Crypto-Calvinism. In 1614 Resen managed to get a special court assembled, presided over by the king, which banished Oluf Kock, a minister who had himself charged Resen with heterodoxy, and prevailed upon Cort Aslakson, a colleague of his at the university, to alter his theological views. Aslakson, a former assistant to Tycho Brahe,

[27] Koch and Kornerup, *Historie*, pp. 182–83, 188–90, 194–97.

had already established himself as a notable theologian by publishing a book in 1613 that attempted to reconcile the astronomical theories of the Danish astronomer with the worldview of the first chapters of Genesis. Trained in part at the Reformed universities in Heidelberg, Basel, and Geneva, he too had shown early leanings towards Calvinism, but, in his later writings, he clearly defended an orthodox Lutheran interpretation of Christology. In 1622 Aslakson also published the first important history of the Danish church.[28]

By 1615, when Resen was appointed bishop of Zealand (Sjaelland), Lutheran Orthodoxy was firmly established in the Danish church. Two years later he presided over the celebration in Denmark of the one hundredth anniversary of the Reformation and published a notable history of the Reformation, entitled *Lutherus triumphans*. This spirit in the church continued under the leadership of Jesper Rasmussen Brochmand, who took over Resen's position in the theological faculty at the university in 1615 and eventually succeeded Resen as bishop of Zealand in 1639. Even more than Resen, Brochmand developed an influence that spread beyond Denmark. He is most noted for his firm defense of the Formula of Concord and for his extensive involvement in polemical theology against Catholics, Calvinists, and Socinians. He published a derisive critique of the Roman papacy in 1628 and a lengthy systematic theology in Latin in 1633. In addition he published commentaries, most notably one on the Epistle of James (1640), and, like the Orthodox to the south, firmly defended biblical inerrancy and verbal inspiration. Although many of his works were very scholarly, he maintained an ability to communicate to simple people. In 1635–1638 he published a collection of sermons, his *Huspostil* or *Sabbati sanctificatio*, that was one of the most popular devotional books in many households for the next two centuries. He also wrote an accessible work such as *Godly Instruction*, warning people who were tempted to go over to the Roman Catholic Church, and *The Christian Man's Spiritual Struggle*, which offered help in overcoming sin, fear and despair.[29]

---

[28] Lyby and Grell, "Consolidation," pp. 128–33; Koch and Kornerup, *Historie*, pp. 197–208; See also Robert Preus. *The Theology of Post-Reformation Lutheranism*, vol. 1 (St. Louis, 1970), pp. 53–54.

[29] Koch and Kornerup, *Historie*, pp. 226, 284–88, 323–24.

The Battle against Superstition, Magic and Witchcraft

Despite the theological differences between the major church leaders in the era of Frederik II and Christian IV, there were certain things that they shared in common. Hemmingsen and Brochmand, who span the full period of these two monarch's reigns, were both committed opponents of magical practices in popular culture and believed that those who dabbled in healing rituals were not only superstitious but often in league with the devil. In 1575 Hemmingsen wrote a treatise on magic entitled, *Admonitio de Superstitionibus magicis vitandis*, in which he attacked six types of folk practice: divination, conjuring, augury, incantation and both maleficium and beneficent magic. Although he expressed disbelief in popular rumors about black sabbaths and the ability of witches to fly, he did not doubt that witches existed and were able to cause harm to people or animals. Hemmingsen's ideas powerfully shaped the outlooks of many pastors because, at the time his book was written, he was vice-chancellor of the University of Copenhagen. When King James VI of Scotland came to Denmark in 1589 to take home Frederik II's daughter, Anne, as his wife, he stayed for six months in Denmark and met Hemmingsen. The king appears to have been influenced by the Danish theologian's ideas about sorcery. The Danes blamed the bad weather the Scottish king faced on the way home on some witches, who were tried in Denmark in 1590. When James got home to Scotland, he extended the blame to local witches near North Berwick, who were also put on trial and executed. This was the first major expression of witchcraft persecution in his realm. Later, in 1597, when James wrote his own book on the danger of witches entitled *Daemonologie*, he credited Hemmingsen as one of his sources.[30] Another Philippist who took action against diabolic manifestations was Jørgen Ericksson. He blamed the Catholic tradition for teaching people that they could ward off harm by superstitious rituals. Like many others, he tended to connect folk magic with efforts to gain power through the devil. While serving as bishop of Stavanger, in 1584, he convinced Frederik II to authorize new local laws that made any form of witchcraft worthy of punishment by death. This legislation was extended to all of Norway in 1593.[31]

---

[30] Christina Larner, "James VI and I and Witchcraft," in *The Reign of James VI and I*. ed. Alan G.R. Smith (New York, 1973), pp. 74–90.

[31] Jens Johansen, "Faith, superstition and witchcraft in Reformation Scandinavia," in Grell, *Scandinavian Reformation*, pp. 179–211.

In 1599 King Christian IV participated in an expedition to northern Norway and Russia, where he was exposed to shamanism among the Sami. A series of mysterious misfortunes during this voyage may have influenced his growing concern about the threat of witchcraft.[32] In 1612 he watched with concern when eleven women in the town of Køge were tried for witchcraft, and by 1617 he had endorsed uniform legislation for Denmark and Norway that portrayed covenanting with the devil as both a heresy and a serious crime. The most intense period of Danish witch-hunting took place between 1617 and 1625 during which time 297 trials were conducted. A contributing reason for this is probably the general tightening up of society that was underway. The drive to enforce uniformity of religious belief was accompanied by a campaign to promote moral reform in society. Popular beliefs about diabolic causes of maleficia were widespread, but these were enhanced by a sophisticated theory of demonology that was articulated by the leading clergy.[33] Jesper Brochmand, the champion of Orthodoxy, possessed extensive holdings on witchcraft in his personal library and also commented on demon possession in 1633 in his major dogmatic summa, *Universae theologiae systema*. In this work he also stated his belief that witches were able to travel through the air at great speeds.[34]

All of the northern regions experienced witch trials in the 16th and 17th centuries, but Denmark showed the most similarity to the patterns that were evident on the continent. In the more remote regions local beliefs and social structures created widely divergent results. In Norway witch-hunting was most intense between 1621–1630 and 1661–1670, mostly based on charges of causing illnesses, deaths, or bad weather. Over four hundred trials took place during the long reign of Christian IV and eighty per cent of the suspects were women. Most of the accused were social outcasts: poor beggars or vagrants. Swedish witch trials also focused mostly on charges of maleficia. The trials peaked,

---

[32] Rune Hagen, "The King, the Cat, and the Chaplain. King Christian IV's Encounter with the Sami Shamans of Northern Norway and Northern Russia in 1599," in *Communicating with the Spirits*, ed. Gábor Klaniczay and Eva Pócs (Budapest, 2005), pp. 246–62.

[33] Jens Johansen, "Denmark: The Sociology of Accusations," in *Early Modern European Witchcraft. Centres and Peripheries*, ed. Bengt Ankarloo and Gustav Henningsen (Oxford, 1990), pp. 339–65.

[34] Jesper Brochmand, *Systema Universae Theologiae* (Ulm, 1658), II Ch. XIX, Casus Conscientiae XIV: An verisimile sit Magos Magasve stupenda celeritate in loca remotissima transferri, ibique cum ejusdem societatis hominibus commessari, choreas agere et ejus generis alia munia obire, et cur hoc ipsum fiat?

however, much later, in the decade after 1668, during the absolutist reign of King Karl XI. In Iceland men were the prime suspects. Women were charged in only ten out of one hundred twenty trials. Similarly in Estonia, sixty per cent of the defendants were men. In Finland, men were generally accused more often than women, but there were regional differences. In areas where Swedish was the predominant language and where Christianity had more deeply penetrated the culture, women were charged with greater frequency, and especially so in the 1670s when the largest number of legal proceedings took place.[35]

Devotional Literature in Denmark and Norway

The tightening up on the church's theological stance and its campaign to eradicate Catholic practices in society did not, however, completely suppress religious diversity in 17th-century Denmark. Throughout the reign of Christian IV there also existed another movement in the church that manifested the influence of the heartfelt piety and practical spirituality developed in Germany by Johann Arndt, author of *Four Books of True Christianity* (1605). At the forefront of this movement was Holger Rosenkrantz, an aristocratic member of the national council who played an important role in the shaping of Danish foreign policy between 1617 and 1627. Educated in Rostock and Wittenberg, Rosenkrantz maintained a deep interest in theology during his government service and was initially a supporter of the attempt to enforce religious uniformity led by Hans Poulsen Resen. However, he experienced a spiritual crisis around 1600 that prompted him to withdraw temporarily from public life. Like Johann Arndt in Germany, he seems to have grown weary of the attention devoted to doctrinal disputes and more interested in the promotion of penitence and the cultivation of spiritual growth. Beginning in 1631, he published a book entitled *Here, Danish Man* and other devotional writings that brought him increasingly under the close scrutiny of the religious authorities. Although Jesper Brochmand's late practical writings also reveal some influence of Arndt, he led the attack on Rosenkrantz, in particular for teaching what appeared to be a doctrine of double justification, first through faith and then through

[35] *Early Modern Witchcraft*, pp. 267, 319–22, 370–75, 386, 399. For a study of regional differences in Finland, see Marko Nenonen, *Noituus, taikuus ja noitavainot: Ala-Satakunnan, Pohjois-Pohjanmaan ja Viipurin Karjalan maaseudulla vuosina 1620–1700* (Helsinki, 1992).

good works. Rosenkrantz defended his concern for putting faith into action, but he faced additional charges from the University's theological faculty for promoting Socianian teachings. He was spared a trial for heresy primarily because his son-in-law became chancellor of the University and influenced the proceedings.[36]

Rosenkrantz also influenced a number of devotional writers in this era who did not face the same degree of criticism. Jens Dinesen Jersin served as professor of metaphysics and later physics at the University before becoming a popular preacher at the most important church in Copenhagen. In 1629 he was appointed bishop of Ribe. Jersin is best known for his stress on a living faith in his book, *Vera via vitae: the way that leads to eternal life* (1633). His son-in-law, Hans Svendsen Chronick, the leading theological lecturer in Christiania (Oslo) from 1640 to 1652, introduced similar sentiments to Norway and, like Arndt, wrote of the possibility of an experiential union with Christ.[37] Caspar Bartholin was a noted professor of medicine in Copenhagen between 1611 and 1629 who, like Arndt, Rosenkrantz and the astronomer Tycho Brahe, had interests in the natural philosophy of Paracelsus.[38] He had also studied philosophy and theology at Wittenberg and transferred to the theological faculty in 1624, after making a vow to do so if he recovered from a near fatal illness. His series of devotional writings, published as *Dr. Caspar's Little Books*, were widely popular.[39]

The Early Reformation in Swedish Territories

Sweden, like Denmark, experienced a long, slow evolution, over the course of a century and a half, towards royal absolutism and the final establishment of Lutheranism as the state religion. The route to this result, however, was dissimilar in several respects, and the relation of

---

[36] Koch and Kornerup, *Historie*, pp. 288–94; Lyby and Grell, "Consolidation," pp. 138–40.

[37] Poul G. Lindhardt. *Den Nordiske Kirkes Historie* (Copenhagen, 1945), pp. 145–50.

[38] Ole Peter Grell, "The Reception of Paracelsianism in early modern Lutheran Denmark: from Peter Severinus, the Dane to Ole Worm," *Medical History* 39 (1995), 78–94; Jole Shackelford, "Rosicrucianism, Lutheran Orthodoxy, and the Rejection of Paracelsianism in Early Seventeenth-Century Denmark," *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 70 (1996), 181–204.

[39] Koch and Kornerup, *Historie*, 227–29.

church to crown ultimately took quite different form.[40] In Denmark there had been some popular support for the Lutheran movement in addition to the impetus to reform originating with the king. As time progressed, the church came to be increasingly under the control of the crown. In Sweden the Lutheran movement was initiated by a royal decree but, once Lutheran leadership was in place within the church, the bishops, with some popular support, managed to regain greater say over religious affairs and affect the religious allegiance of later monarchs. While Denmark experienced internal debate about the influence of Calvinism and was affected eventually by the doctrinal debates that determined much of the public face of German Lutheranism in the late 16th century, Sweden wrestled more with the endurance of Roman Catholic influences. It had fewer theologians of international significance, so its development can best be traced by a focus on the evolution of liturgy and polity.

Lutheran ideas circulated among German merchants in Sweden around the time of the Stockholm Bloodbath in 1520, but townspeople and peasants in the countryside were relatively untouched by the reform movement before Gustav Vasa began the reorientation of the church as part of his plan to establish independence from Denmark and diminish the power of Sweden's Catholic bishops. In 1523, the year he was elected king, he gained control of Finland and began to draw together advisors concerning religious affairs who were trained in Wittenberg and sympathetic to evangelical theology. Laurentius Andreae became his secretary and Olaus Petri the chief preacher for the city of Stockholm. Under their leadership Sweden's ties with Rome began to be cut at the Diet of Västerås in 1527, and control of church properties was turned over to the state. The Ordinances circulated after this parliamentary assembly called for the pure preaching of the Word of God and identified that with the interpretations presented by Andreae and Petri. Already in 1526 Petri had completed a Swedish translation of the New Testament. The Reformation was advanced further by the appointment of his younger brother, Laurentius Petri, as archbishop of Uppsala in 1531. Since the bishop of Västerås, previously ordained by the pope, supported some reforms and agreed to participate in this

[40] Poul G. Lindhardt, "Reformationen i Norden i komparativ belysning," in Andrén, *Reformationen i Norden*, pp. 9–27.

event, the Swedish church maintained apostolic succession even as it moved in a Protestant direction.[41]

Starting in 1536, the mass was celebrated in Swedish and priestly celibacy was abolished, but there were still few signs of popular support for these changes. Calls for the retention of the old religion were often expressed during the scattered peasant rebellions of this era. The king himself appeared to favor the establishment of a reformed national church that did not stray too far from Catholic tradition. Thus, when Olaus Petri and Laurentius Andreae attempted to introduce more clearly Lutheran practices and to preserve some separation between church and state, Gustav Vasa took measures at the Diet of Örebro in 1539 to limit their political influence. He dismissed the two reformers and condemned them to death on the charge of treason although he later pardoned them. Gustav Vasa appointed a German counselor, Georg Norman, as a lay overseer of the church. Norman's attempt to carry out an intrusive church visitation and additional economic policies proposed by Conrad von Pyhy, the king's new German chancellor, prompted a revolt in 1542, led by Nils Dacke. To restore social control, the king dismissed von Pyhy. Norman, however, remained as his advisor, and neither Olaus Petri or Andreae fully regained the influence they had had at the beginning of the Swedish Reformation. The king consolidated his control of church and state and, at the Diet of Västerås in 1544, managed to get the *Riksdag* to endorse a hereditary monarchy. When priests with Catholic sympathies attempted at this event to bring about the restoration of the traditional faith, the king clearly declared his support for Lutheranism.[42]

In this same decade there were decisive advances for the Reformation in Finland. Since 1536 Finnish students returning from studies in Wittenberg had begun to spread evangelical ways of thought among the populace.[43] Chief among these was Michael Agricola who, as schoolmaster in Åbo (Turku), published the first book in the Finnish language in 1543: the *ABC-book*, a basic primer that included Luther's Small Catechism. Four years later he issued a Finnish translation of

---

[41] Robert Murray, *A Brief History of the Church of Sweden* (Stockholm, 1961), pp. 22–31.

[42] E.I. Kouri, "The early Reformation in Sweden and Finland, c. 1520–1560," in Grell, *Scandinavian Reformation*, pp. 42–69.

[43] On the Finnish students in Wittenberg at this time, see Simo Heininen, *Die finnischen Studenten in Wittenberg 1531–1552* (Helsinki, 1980).

the New Testament. By 1549 Finland had its own church manual containing instructions for worship, and a liturgy that was translated from the Swedish mass initiated by Olaus Petri. Gustav Vasa divided Finland into two diocese in 1550, appointing Agricola as bishop of Åbo and Paavali Juusten, another student of Luther, as bishop of Viborg (Viipuri). When Agicola died prematurely in 1557, Juusten became the most influential leader of the church. He was diligent in conducting visitations throughout his diocese, improved the educational standards of his clergy, and organized the first synodical meetings in Finland. In 1563 he was tranferred to the more important diocese of Åbo where he served as bishop until his death in 1576.[44]

Laurentius Petri and the Church Order of 1571

After Gustav Vasa's death in 1560 the strength of the Swedish monarchy was diminished by costly political maneuvers and infighting between his sons. Erik XIV's reign was troubled by the Seven Years War against Denmark and Poland, further incidents of civil war, and costly efforts to expand into the Baltic region. His own theological views were largely shaped by Melanchthon's, but he set himself up for additional problems by inviting in Calvinist refugees from France and Germany. Laurentius Petri, the bishop of Uppsala, took advantage of the fact that the king had restored significant power to the church's bishops and began to work to curtail the influx of non-Lutheran influences.[45] This new assertiveness on the part of church leaders advanced further after Erik XIV was deposed by his half-brother, Johan III, in 1568.[46]

Soon after Gustav Vasa's death Laurentius Petri had begun to draw up a new church order that was modeled on similar documents from the Lutheran territorial churches of Württemberg and Mecklenburg. Much less of an innovator than his elder brother, he advocated a rich, traditional liturgy but a somewhat flexible theology in his various writings. When Johan III came to the throne, the bishop was presented with the opportunity to put these cautious proposals into effect. The new

[44] Jaakko Gummerus. *Michael Agricola, Der Reformator Finnlands* (Helsinki, 1941), pp. 40–67.

[45] Ingun Montgomery, "Die Bedeutung Melanchthons für die schwedische Ausformung der Reformation," in *Phillip Melanchthon und seine Rezeption in Skandinavien*, ed. Birgit Stolt (Stockholm, 1998), pp. 109–11.

[46] Michael Roberts, *The Early Vasas: A History of Sweden, 1523–1611* (Cambridge, 1968), pp. 273–77.

king was well-educated in theology and sympathetic to Petri's reverence for tradition. As a result, he supported the creation of the *Church Order* of 1571. Thirty-two years after Denmark had approved its first evangelical church order, Sweden now established its own complete set of post-Catholic regulations for church governance.

Worthy of note is the *Church Order*'s vagueness about doctrine and its conservatism with regard to matters of church practice. Although distancing the church from Catholicism, it made no reference to the Augsburg Confession or even to Martin Luther. It did, however, recommend the *Loci communes* of Melanchthon. On the topic of the nature of Christ's presence in the Lord's Supper, an issue being hotly debated among Lutherans in Germany at that time, the Church Order suggested a real presence but did not define the mode of the presence. It rejected transubstantiation but did not prohibit the elevation of the elements or their veneration. The overall principle governing its decisions on the conduct of worship was the argument that there is no reason to change practices that the Bible does not explicitly forbid. Thus, the Church Order called for the retention of vestments, the use of the sign of the cross, and exorcism as part of the baptismal rite. The Creed was to be recited in Swedish, but there was no complete prohibition of the use of Latin in services (similar to Brandenburg and parts of Saxony at this time). Concerning church organization, the Church Order made a clear distinction between bishops and priests. The concept of a cathedral chapter was maintained, and bishops were accountable directly to the king instead of to a consistory involving both clergy and laity, as was the most common practice in the territorial churches of Germany. The clarified regulations envisioned the appointment of bishops by the king and a close interlocking of secular and spiritual government. The Church Order, therefore, associated the support of education and the maintenance of communal discipline quite closely with the church.[47]

[47] Conrad Bergendoff, "The Unique Character of the Reformation in Sweden," in *The Symposium on 17th Century Lutheranism*, I, (St. Louis, 1962), pp. 91–105; Louis Dewailly, "Laurentius Petri et la Kyrkoordning de 1571," *Istina* 30 (1985), 228–45; Heinz Schrey, "Geistliches und weltliches Regiment in der schwedischen Reformation," *ARG* 42 (1951), 151–54.

The Resurgence of Catholic Influences

In 1576, three years after the death of Laurentius Petri, church law was clarified even more precisely by the enforcement of supplementary regulations known as the *Nova Ordinantia*, drawn up at the king's request by Petrus Mikaelis Fecht, a Wittenberg-educated Melanchthonian. The document's emphasis on preaching and its rejection of the veneration of saints and images seemed in accordance with Lutheran theology, but on some matters of doctrine it revealed the influence of Georg Cassander, a Roman Catholic writer whose irenic approach to theology had found favor with Johan III. In particular, its emphasis on the early church fathers and the way it spoke of faith and good works suggested an effort to get beyond the disputes that separated Catholics and Protestants. This disturbed some of the clergy, as did its endorsement of the retention of at least one monastery in every diocese.[48]

Johan III had married Katarina Jagellonica, a Polish princess, in 1562, and allowed her to continue the practice of her Catholic faith. The king had strong interests in the maintenance of an aesthetically pleasing liturgy, which inclined him further to look favorably on some aspects of Catholic worship. This prompted him to propose, in addition to the *Nova Ordinantia*, the enactment of a new ritual for the mass that would be richer and more dignified that the worship practices that had been introduced in the 1530s under the influence of Olaus Petri. Formulated in 1576 and presented to the *Riksdag* in 1577, the *Liturgia svecanae eccleasiae*, also know as the *Red Book*, increased the use of vestments and incorporated some elements of the Roman liturgy. The bishops had more reservations than the rest of the *Riksdag*, but they eventually supported the new liturgy after much debate. There existed, however, a minority movement within the clergy that saw the *Red Book* as further evidence of the king's Catholic leanings.[49]

The exact nature of Johan III's religious convictions has been a matter of extended debate. Some historians have argued that Johan III moved steadily closer to Catholicism and even secretly converted in 1578. Others, however, have perceived more continuity in his attitudes

---

[48] Roberts. *Early Vasas*, 279–81.

[49] Hjalmar Holmquist, *Svenska Kyrkans Historia III: Reformationstidevarvet 1521–1611* (Stockholm, 1933), pp. 41–51. See also Simo Heininen, "Die Patristische Argumentation im Sogenannten 'Liturgiestreit' (1575–1593) in Schweden," in *Auctoritas Patrum II. Neue Beiträge zur Rezeption der Kirchenväter im 15. und 16. Jahrhundert*, ed. Leif Grane et al. (Mainz, 1998), pp. 77–84.

and have hesitated to conclude from his liturgical innovations that he had completely abandoned his appreciation for Protestant reforms. Throughout his reign he defended the offering of the cup to the laity, clerical marriage, and worship in the vernacular. The question remains whether he held to these innovations in order to obscure his Catholic sympathies and to avoid unrest within the church or whether these issues were truly important to him.[50] In any case there is no doubt that he entered into negotiations with Rome in this period and opened the way for an influx of Jesuit missionaries into Sweden.

Pope Gregory XIII had created a special congregation of cardinals to work towards the reconversion of northern Europe and had high hopes that Sweden would be a fertile field because the queen continued to be Catholic. To counsel her with regard to her scruples about communing in both kinds, as Johan III wished, the pope had sent a Polish Jesuit, Stanislas Warszewicki, to the Swedish court in 1574. He was joined in 1576 by Laurentius Nicolai Norvegus, a Norwegian Jesuit. While serving as private chaplain for the queen, Norvegus began an ambitious effort to recatholicize Sweden. The king appreciated his support for the *Red Book* liturgy and soon advanced him to greater responsibilities. The University of Uppsala had declined greatly during the reign of Gustav Vasa, and Johan III decided to open a new theological college in Stockholm to restore higher education within Sweden. Norvegus (who also came to be known popularly as Klosterlasse) was appointed as professor and later rector of this new institution. He attracted many students and avoided controversy by making efforts to conceal his allegiance to Catholicism.[51]

King Johan showed interest in opening up more extensive negotiations with Rome for several possible reasons. He hoped to ease the way towards possession of a substantial inheritance in Italy that had been bequeathed to his wife by her brother, the king of Poland, when he died in 1572. He also hoped to clarify the status of the Swedish bishops with regard to apostolic succession after doubts about their status had been raised by Warszewicki. The king apparently even envisioned the possibility that the pope might put the latter matter to rest by

---

[50] Martin Friedrich, "Johann III von Schweden (1568–1592): Ein König im Spannungsfeld von Gegenreformation und Konfessionalisierung," *ZKG* 109 (1998), 200–15.

[51] Oskar Garstein, *Rome and the Counter-Reformation in Scandinavia. Vol. 1 (1539–1583)* (Bergen, 1963), pp. 89–123.

approving of the consecration of Petrus Fecht as a new bishop. The pope's response to the king's overtures was to send Antonio Possevino, a former secretary-general of the Jesuit Order, to Sweden to explore the prospects for ecclesiastical reunion.[52] A number of aristocratic members of the national council had begun to commune according to the Roman rite, under the influence of Norvegus. Johan III himself had stopped participating in Lutheran liturgies after Easter 1577 and received communion from Possevino after his arrival in Stockholm in 1578. However, the king clearly indicated that the next step towards reconciliation with Rome would require concessions regarding lay reception of the communion cup, the right of the clergy to marry, and continuation of worship in the Swedish language. Possevino brought this message back to the pope, who rejected the proposal. Johan III became disillusioned and once again began to commune according to the liturgy of the Church of Sweden. When Possevino returned to Sweden, he called upon his Jesuit co-workers to reveal their identity as priests. The surprising revelation that key educators were Catholic prompted riots in Stockholm. In the face of this unrest Johan III dismissed Norvegus and refused further contact with Possevino. In the middle of 1580 most of the pope's representatives left Sweden, marking the end of his ambitious *missio suevica*.[53]

Opposition to the *Red Book* of 1576 had been led by clerics such as Martin Gestricius, the superintendent in Gävle (later bishop of Linköping) and Abraham Angermannus, rector of the Stockholm Grammar School (later archbishop of Uppsala). After the unveiling of the Catholic reconversion campaign, another formidable figure became active in the movement against the royal liturgy. The king's brother, Karl, duke of Södermanland, offered protection to church leaders who had fallen out of favor with Johan III and defended the *Church Order* of 1571 against all later innovations. Johan III and Karl reached a compromise settlement in 1587. The king agreed not to force use of the *Red Book* in Karl's duchy as long as Karl would constrain the most vehement of the king's critics. Relations between the brothers became strained again, however, when the clergy of the duchy asserted their independence by drawing up the *Confessio Strengnensis*. They persisted in their polemics against the royal liturgy and also, for the first time,

[52] Ibid., pp. 129–44.
[53] Ibid., pp. 178–91, 203–16.

explicitly declared their allegiance to the Augsburg Confession.[54] At this point the duchy of Södermanland almost functioned as an autonomous principality within Sweden.

The leading figure in Finland during this period was Ericus Erici Sorolainen, who had studied at Rostock with David Chytraeus. After serving briefly as a court preacher for Johan III and headmaster of the influential Latin school in Gavle, he was appointed bishop of Åbo in 1583. The diocese of Viborg, which had lacked a bishop since 1578, was also temporarily placed under his control. Sorolainen was a humanist with Philippist sympathies but often seemed opportunistic throughout his life. His loyalty to Johan III made him open to the introduction of the *Nova Ordinantia* in Finland and even to greater use of Latin as a liturgical option. Like the king he had a strong interest in encouraging study of the early church fathers. Sorolainen also contributed significantly to Finnish ecclesiastical literature through his publication of a catechism based on German sources and an influential book of sermons. He continued work on the production of a Finnish translation of the whole Bible but died before that project was completed in 1642.[55]

Sigismund, King of Poland, and the Uppsala Assembly of 1593

The death of Johan III in 1592 created further complications for religious life because his son, Sigismund, the rightful heir, was a committed Roman Catholic and had left Sweden in 1587 after being elected king of Poland. Until he returned to Sweden, the Council and his uncle, Duke Karl, established a joint interim government. Since the 1587 Vadstena settlement with his brother, Johan III, Karl had been calling for a church assembly to restore harmony within the kingdom by settling the dispute between Liturgists and Anti-Liturgists. Now in a position of power, Karl gathered the church leaders in order to set policies in place before the arrival of the Catholic king. Many of the clergy, for their part, had good reasons to believe that Duke Karl's motives were as much political as theological, but the Uppsala Assembly of 1593 became for them the decisive opportunity to clarify the Lutheran identity of their church. The events of the most recent decades convinced many

[54] Roberts, *Early Vasas*, pp. 284–95.

[55] Montgomery, "The Institutionalisation of Lutheranism in Sweden and Finland" in Grell, *Scandinavian Reformation*, pp. 175–77.

of the dangers inherent in the longstanding vagueness of the church's confessional stance. They unanimously agreed to make the Augsburg Confession the standard for all of Sweden and required allegiance to it by all future monarchs. The Formula of Concord, however, was not brought up for discussion. It would not become an official confessional document for the Swedish church until 1686.[56] It proved to be more difficult to establish agreement on matters of ceremony, but in the end, the standard set by the *Church Order* of 1571 was reestablished, without the amendments contained in the *Nova Ordinantia*. The Assembly also rejected the *Red Book*, once and for all. Bishops who had conceded the use of Johan's liturgy were forced to confess their errors. The victory of the strict Lutherans was sealed by the election of Abraham Angermannus as archbishop of Uppsala.[57]

Copies of the Resolution from the Uppsala Assembly were circulated throughout the country in order to gain widespread support for making the coronation of the new king conditional upon its acceptance. Since it required Sigismund to adhere to the Augsburg Confession, the new situation raised questions about the 1544 law that had made the monarchy hereditary. Sigismund resisted any restrictions on his power but was forced by Duke Karl and the estates to guarantee the right of his subjects to remain Protestant. However, Sigismund arrived in Stockholm in late 1593 without having yet explicitly declared his personal adherence to the conditions of the Resolution. The clergy drew up an additional list of Postulata, which insisted that the new king raise his son as a Lutheran and take no part in making church appointments. This caused a delay of the coronation ceremony until Sigismund agreed to an Accession Charter that included further concessions, such as a promise not to appoint any non-Lutherans to government positions.[58]

During the struggles with Sigismund the governor of Finland was Klas Fleming, a former admiral who harbored a deep animosity towards Duke Karl. Due to his influence, only a few Finnish clergy attended the Uppsala Assembly in 1593. A meeting of the *Riksdag* at Soderköping in 1595 recognized Karl as head of Sweden's government, but Fleming

---

[56] Lewis W. Spitz, "Discord, Dialogue, and Concord: The Lutheran Reformation's Formula of Concord," *Concordia Theological Quarterly*, 43 (1979), 185.

[57] Montgomery, "Institutionalisation," pp. 156–60; On the liturgical developments from 1593 onward, see Toivo Harjunpaa, "Liturgical Developments in Sweden and Finland in the Era of Lutheran Orthodoxy (1593–1700)," *CH* 37 (1968), 14–35.

[58] Roberts, *Early Vasas*, pp. 336–52.

continued to enforce recognition of Sigismund's authority in Finland. His treatment of the people was so brutal that he provoked a peasant uprising there in 1596, known as the Club War. Duke Karl invaded Finland shortly after Fleming's death in 1597 and suppressed the pockets of royalist support. Bishop Ericus Sorolainen had also resisted Fleming's efforts to introduce Catholic ritual practices to Finland, but because he had supported Johan III's milder liturgical proposals, Karl dismissed him from his see. Later Sorolainen was transported to Uppsala to be tried by the cathedral chapter. When its members acquitted him, he was restored to his office, which he continued to hold for another twenty years.[59]

Sigismund now faced a united front from all of the estates in the *Riksdag* and was forced to accept checks on his power regarding a range of matters in addition to religion. When he returned to Poland shortly after his coronation, Karl and the council (*rad*) governed Sweden jointly as regents. New tensions developed among the ruling parties and also with Sigismund's representatives until the king assembled troops and set forth on a campaign plan to reassert his control of Sweden. After an inconclusive battle at Stangebro in 1598, the treaty of Linköping forced further concessions from Sigismund. When it appeared that he would not abide by what he had promised, a *Riksdag* met at Jonköping in 1599 and deposed him. The estates were prepared to pass the throne to his son, Wladyslaw, if Sigismund agreed to have him brought up as a Lutheran under the tutelage of Duke Karl. Six months later, after Sigismund ignored the ultimatum, they elected Karl as king.[60]

The Church's Resistance to Royal Domination

It took Karl IX a while to be persuaded to accept the crown. Although he had the support of the estates, it was a weighty matter to be displacing the rightful heir of a hereditary monarchy. However, after he agreed to his coronation in 1604, he worked vigorously to strengthen his control over all aspects of society. After the Uppsala Assembly of 1593 the Lutheran character of the Swedish church finally seemed to be firmly established, but now church leaders faced new battles with

[59] Ibid., pp. 337–38, 366–67, 371–73; Montgomery, "Institutionalisation," p. 176.
[60] Michael Roberts, *Gustavus Adolphus—A History of Sweden 1611–1632*, 2 vols. (London, 1953, 1958), 1:14–25; *Early Vasas*, pp. 369–84.

Karl IX, who attempted to regain the control over the church that his father, Gustav Vasa, had previously had. Karl interfered frequently in the process of electing bishops during his reign, contrary to the procedures established by the *Church Order* of 1571. He attempted to reduce the power of cathedral chapters and exercise complete control over the awarding of all benefices. Furthermore, his Philippist orientation on doctrinal matters now seemed to progress further in a more evidently Calvinist direction. From 1595 on he had been proposing a revision of the service book for worship. When he brought his proposed *Handbook* up for approval at a *Riksdag* in 1600, church leaders such as Olaus Martini, Laurentius Paulinus Gothus, and Johannes Rudbeckius joined Abraham Angermannus in rejecting it. Earlier, when the chief threat seemed to be Catholicism, Karl IX had gone along with the bishop's introduction of the Augsburg Confession. Now, however, he expressed reservations about its content. At the time of his coronation the most he would do was accept the Augsburg Confession "in so far as it was accordant with Scripture". Over the decades Luther's Small Catechism had circulated widely and acquired a special prominence for popular piety because it was briefer and more portable than the Bible. In 1604 Karl IX audaciously called for the introduction of a new catechism that was discernibly influenced by the Heidelberg Catechism from Germany. When the conflicts with church leaders reached a low point in 1607, Karl IX threatened to abdicate. This caused widespread concern among all of the estates and made his fiercest critics more restrained in their polemics. An uneasy truce prevailed until his death in 1611.[61]

Karl IX's son, Gustavus Adolphus, was only seventeen years old at that time and, by the Succession Pact of 1604, was not entitled to take complete control of the country until he was 24. Nevertheless, he had been well-trained in governmental affairs, and the *Riksdag* agreed to acknowledge him immediately as king as long as he was willing to abide by the terms of a charter they drew up. The Charter of 1612 protected the role of the aristocracy by stressing the king's duty to consult with the Council about all important matters of finance and foreign policy. In addition, he was asked to honor the church's demand that he accept the Augsburg Confession and the decisions of the Uppsala Assembly of 1593. The bishops, who were now widely supportive of Lutheran Orthodoxy, also asked for his adherence to the Formula of

[61] Ibid., pp. 412–26.

Concord. Gustavus agreed to the first two conditions but would not commit himself to the last. He was personally pious and committed to upholding the Lutheran faith, but, like most of the previous kings of Denmark and Sweden, he had little interest in creating strict standards of orthodoxy for his national church or in dividing the forces of Protestantism by emphasis on problematic theological distinctions. Although his court chaplains were conservative Lutherans, Gustavus Adolphus showed inclinations towards greater tolerance at various points in his life. He married Maria Eleonora, daughter of the Calvinist elector of Brandenburg, in 1620 and had contacts while at war in Germany with John Durie, a Scottish Presbyterian turned Anglican, who campaigned for a closer union among the Protestant churches. In 1627 the king invited Protestants of all sorts who were facing persecution in Germany to seek asylum in Sweden.[62]

The coronation of Gustavus Adolphus did not take place until October 1617, within days of the one-hundredth anniversary of the start of Luther's Reformation. In contrast to Denmark, little was done in Sweden to mark this religious centenary. Instead, the king called for a commemoration, six years later, of the centenary of the election of Gustav Vasa as king of independent Sweden. There was a more evident political focus to those celebrations though the king also praised his grandfather for being the instrument by which God suppressed papal idolatry and restored the true preaching of the Word. One of the most notable religious aspects of the event was the awarding of the first four theological doctorates in Sweden to celebrate the fact that it was no longer dependent on foreign universities to educate its church leaders. The sermons delivered on that occasion, on texts chosen by Gustavus Adolphus, were patriotic and compared the king to Constantine.[63] Yet, new tensions soon emerged between the king and the bishops in response to some of his efforts to reorganize the relationship of church and state.

In 1619 the bishops presented the king with the draft of a proposed new church order, a revision of an earlier version prepared in 1608 during the reign of Karl IX. Many issues of concern remained unresolved by prior legislation, and there was widespread dissatisfaction

---

[62] Roberts, *Gustavus Adolphus*, 1:360–72.

[63] Montgomery, "Institutionalization," pp. 171–72; Ole Peter Grell, "Scandinavia," in Scribner, *Reformation in National Context*, pp. 111–13.

related to the divergence of practices across the various dioceses. The king, however, showed little enthusiasm for approving a new church order. In 1623 he produced his own proposal for ecclesiastical reform: the setting up of a *consistorium generale* that would integrate the administration of the church into the coherently designed system of government being introduced by his most trusted advisor, Axel Oxenstierna. Educated at Rostock, Jena and Wittenberg, Oxenstierna had initially been encouraged by his family to enter the service of the church. Although he always remained very interested in matters of faith, he was asked by Karl IX to take a government appointment when he returned to Sweden and advanced to the position of chancellor in 1612 at the beginning of the reign of Gustavus Adolphus.

Since the time of Gustav Vasa the clergy had been viewed as a separate estate, one of four that were represented in the *Riksdag*. Whenever the *Riksdag* assembled, the bishops and superintendents represented the church in its relations with the secular government and sometimes met separately to deal with important disciplinary cases, thus acting as a kind of supreme appelate court.[64] In place of this sporadic meeting of higher clergy, Gustavus Adolphus and Oxenstierna proposed the creation, in 1623, of a permanent consistory made up of twelve members, half clergy (only three bishops) and half lay. In addition to functioning like a church court, this new body was to be charged with the task of revising the church order, conducting church inspections and overseeing schools, hospitals and church affairs in Finland and Sweden's Baltic territories. It was to be organized like the other permanently staffed collegia that efficiently governed society under the ultimate control of the monarch. This new system would have introduced a consistorial structure similar to those that had already been set up in many of the German territorial churches, but the higher clergy did not want this structure in Sweden. At the head of this group stood Johannes Rudbeckius, a former court chaplain who had become bishop of Västerås in 1618 and who, as professor at Uppsala, was perhaps the most important dogmatician of Sweden in the 17th century.[65] When

[64] Roberts, *Gustavus Adolphus*, 1:297–99, 406–08. See also Stellan Dahlgren, "Estates and Classes," in *Sweden's Age of Greatness 1632–1718*, ed. Michael Roberts (London, 1973), pp. 115–19.

[65] *Johannes Rudbeckius (1581–1646). Loci theologici: föreläsningar vid Uppsala universitet, 1611–1613*, ed. Bengt Hägglund (Stockholm, 2001).

the *Riksdag* met in Stockholm in 1624, the bishops refused to accept any diminution of their current powers. Their counter-proposal was a committee of thirteen clergy, including all of the bishops, and only a few lay representatives. Well aware of the clergy's ability to influence public opinion, Gustavus Adolphus withdrew his original plan and, in 1625, called for a new collegium made up of thirteen pastors from the Stockholm area. He proposed to exclude the bishops, arguing that they were too busy to serve on this body, but he was willing to balance this alteration by making the lay representatives non-voting members.

In this period some of the lower clergy resented the fact that the bishops were becoming a tight-knit group, often linked by intermarriage among their families, who seemed to sympathize with the nobility and had little connection to the many pastors who lived like the peasants they served in country districts. These sentiments were expressed most clearly by Johannes Baazius, a vicar in Jonköping, whose criticisms of the bishops culminated in 1629 with the anonymous publication of a highly polemical book entitled *Prosphonesis*, and by Johannes Matthiae, a professor at Uppsala (later bishop of Strängnäs), who prepared two disputations in defense of the king.[66] Gustavus Adolphus and Oxenstierna hoped to capitalize on these grievances, but they finally turned their attention to other matters when their reorganization plan created more problems than it was worth. As a result, the Swedish Lutheran bishops managed to preserve for themselves a degree of power unmatched in any of the other Lutheran church structures of Europe.[67] However, this did not preclude the government's ability to rely on the church to serve its own interests. Both parties had much to gain from mutual assistance. During the 17th century the government counted on the clergy to disseminate information from the pulpit and to muster support for public policies. The clergy were expected to serve as agents of social discipline, constraining misbehavior by public penance or the assessment of monetary fines. They bore an increasingly arduous burden as keepers of communal records and were used by the government as agents for the preparation of tax assessments. At times,

[66] Martin Carlson, "Johannes Matthiae and the Development of the Church of Sweden during the First Half of the 17th Century," *CH* 13 (1944), 289–309; Roberts, *Gustavus Adolphus*, pp. 388–92.

[67] Michael Roberts, "The Swedish Church," in *Sweden's Age of Greatness*, pp. 154–67.

this distracted them from spiritual activities or hampered their relations with their parishioners.[68]

Lutheranism in the Baltic Region

Gustavus Adolphus had limited success in reshaping church-state relations in his own territories because his attentions were often distracted by foreign policy. During his reign he managed to elevate Sweden to the status of one of the great powers in Europe, first by expanding Swedish influence in the Baltic region and then by intervening on the continent during the Thirty Years War. By 1629 Sweden had ended its long rivalry with Poland and gained control of much of the east coast of the Baltic Sea. A year later Gustavus Adolphus landed with his troops in Pomerania and attempted to succeed where Christian IV of Denmark had failed, as leader of the Protestant states in the prolonged battle against the Catholic League and the Habsburg dynasty.

The battle for hegemony in the Baltic began well before the time of Gustavus Adolphus, with the start of the Russo-Livonian War in 1558. Ivan IV, the Russian czar, invaded Livland (central Livonia) in order to secure access to the sea and, in so doing hastened the dissolution of the old confederation that had been formed by the Livonian and Teutonic Orders during the Middle Ages. Denmark, Sweden, and Poland all had important interests in regional trade and responded to Russia by initiating their own efforts to secure Baltic territories. King Frederik II of Denmark purchased the island of Ösel (Saaremaa) from its last prince-bishop in 1560 and gave it to his younger brother, Magnus. The city of Reval (Tallinn) and the surrounding region of Estland (northern Estonia) accepted occupation by Sweden in 1561. Similarly, a year later, Riga, the leading city of southern Livonia, and the adjacent region of Courland sought protection from the Russians by becoming a fief of Lithuania. In 1569 Lithuania, in turn, merged with the kingdom of Poland in the Union of Lublin.

Denmark's and Sweden's competing claims to Baltic territories brought about the Nordic Seven Year War, which began in 1563 during the reigns of Frederik II and Erik XIV and ended, with inconclusive results, in 1570. After that time Denmark became less assertive in its

[68] Roberts, *Gustavus Adolphus*, 1:399–416.

efforts to secure eastern territory and eventually sold its holdings to Poland. Sweden, however, persisted in its Baltic campaign since it felt more immediately at risk from potential expansion by either Poland or Russia. Sweden annexed more of Estland (northern Estonia) in 1584 and went to war again with Russia in 1590, resulting in further territorial gains. During the reign of Gustavus Adolphus Sweden fought another war with Poland, which was still ruled at that time by his cousin, Sigismund. The Swedish-Polish War began in 1621 and ended with the Truce of Altmark in 1629, according to which Sweden was granted control over most of Livonia and parts of eastern Prussia. Sweden remained the dominant power in the eastern Baltic area until the Great Northern War of 1700.[69]

Since the 13th century the Estonians in the north, speaking a Finno-Ugric language, and the Latvians in the south, speaking a Baltic language, had been a mostly landless peasantry, working as serfs on the estates of German landowners. It was among the German ruling class that Lutheranism first penetrated the region in the 1520s, starting in Riga, an important Baltic trade center for the Hanseatic League. It took only ten days for the citizens of Riga to learn of the posting of the 95 Theses in 1517, and by 1522 two priests, Andreas Knopken and Sylvester Tegetmeyer, were delivering sermons in the city's primary churches that were influenced by Luther's ideas. Knopken persuaded the city councilors to hold a public debate in 1522 that increased sympathy for the Reformation. Johann Lohmüller, the city clerk, wrote to Luther and received a reply in 1523 entitled *To the Christians of Riga, Reval and Dorpat*. Later, Luther would also write, especially for the Baltic Germans, an exposition of Psalm 127 and an admonition concerning public worship (1525). Johann Briessmann, who had introduced Lutheranism to Königsberg in Prussia, was invited to Riga in 1527. He drew up the first evangelical church order for Livonia.[70]

The reformers of Riga also had contact with the Estonians further north. In 1523 local priests in Reval, Johannes Lang, Zacharias Hasse, and Hermann Marsow, began to preach in the evangelical style. Some landowners supported the new movement primarily because it gave them the opportunity to seize property owned by the Catholic church.

---

[69] Robert Frost, *The Northern Wars 1558–1721* (Harlow, England, 2000), pp. 23–37, 102–14.

[70] Janis Matulis, "Die ersten Schritte der Reformation in Riga," in *Luther und Luthertum in Osteuropa*, ed. Gerhard Bassarak and Gunter Wirth (Berlin, 1983), pp. 354–63.

Between 1522 and 1524 iconoclastic riots broke out in Riga and Dorpat (Tartu) due to the arrival in the region of the apocalyptic Anabaptist, Melchior Hoffman. After his expulsion in 1526 a milder form of Lutheranism, retaining elements of Catholic tradition, became more common in the churches although Catholic bishops were allowed to remain in Reval and Dorpat.[71]

At first, the Reformation was confined to the German population of the Baltic though there were already, in the 1520s, a few congregations for Latvians and Estonians in the major towns where they heard preaching in their own languages. There were no significant religious publications in these languages until the latter half of the 17th century. In 1554 a Lutheran catechism in Estonian was printed in Germany. The first clearly identifiable book written in Latvian was a Catholic catechism based on the writings of the Jesuit theologian, Peter Canisius, printed in Lithuania in 1586. Shortly thereafter, a commission of Lutheran church leaders in Courland published a Latvian handbook in Königsberg that contained a catechism, some hymns, and portions of the New Testament.[72] In 1600 three-quarters of the Lutheran clergy in Courland were still from Germany, although some pastors were making an effort to learn the languages of the peasantry.[73] The first original book-length text in Latvian was the *Lettische Postill* by Georgius Mancelius, a professor in Dorpat, which was completed around 1639 and published in Riga in 1654. A complete Bible in Latvian would not be available until 1685.[74]

---

[71] Karl Laantee, "The Beginning of the Reformation in Estonia," *CH* 22 (1953), 270–78; Edgar Hark, "Estnische Evangelisch-Lutherische Kirche (EELK) von Martin Luther bis zur Gegenwart," in *Luther und Luthertum*, pp. 330–53; Toivo Raun, *Estonia and the Estonians* (Stanford, 2001) pp. 15–25.

[72] Eberhard Treulieb, "Die Reformation der kurländischen Kirche," in *Baltische Kirchengeschichte*, ed. Reinhard Wittram (Gottingen, 1956), p. 85; Andrejs Plakans, *The Latvians: A Short History* (Stanford, CA, 1995), pp. 31–40.

[73] Kirby, *Northern Europe in the Early Modern Period*, p. 92. On the piety of the period, see Jürgen Beyer, "Conceptions of holiness in the Lutheran countries, c. 1550–1700," in *Papers Delivered at the Symposium Christian Folk Religion*, ed. Ülo Valk (Tartu, 1999), pp. 137–68; idem, "Implementing Lutheran cultural Patterns in the Baltic Provinces, c. 1630–1710," in *Zones of Fracture in Modern Europe: the Baltic Countries, the Balkans, and Northern Italy*, ed. Almut Bues (Wiesbaden, 2005), pp. 205–16; idem, "Strategien zur Hebung der Frömmigkeit in Est- und Livland (1621–1700). Konfessionalisierung und Pietismus," in *Confessionalism and Pietism. Religious Reform in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Fred van Lieburg (Mainz, 2006), 111–28.

[74] Janis Kreslins, *Dominus narrabit in scriptura populorum. A Study of Early 17th-Century Lutheran Teaching and Preaching in the* Lettische lang-gewünschte Postill *of Georg Mancelius* (Wiesbaden, 1992), pp. 123–27.

The Swedish-Polish War significantly disrupted religious life throughout the Baltic. In areas that had come under the control of Poland, the Jesuits went on the offensive to advance the Counter-Reformation. There were, reputedly, only seven Lutheran pastors left in southern Livonia in 1622. Gustavus Adolphus appointed Herman Samsonius, a Riga pastor, as superintendent for that region in the same year and instructed him to carry out visitations and appoint new pastors. Nevertheless, the revival of the church was limited until the end of the war, when Johan Skytte arrived as Governor-General in 1630. He suppressed manifestations of traditional folk religion among the peasantry and attempted to enforce regular church attendance. He established the first Baltic university in Dorpat in 1632 and made provisions there for the teaching of local languages so that pastors could be equipped to communicate better with the peasantry. In 1633 Skytte introduced a new church order for Livonia. One of its notable features was the creation of a *consistorium generale* of the sort that Gustavus Adolphus had been unable to implement for the church back in Sweden.[75]

In 1626 Gustavus Adolphus visited Tallinn in northern Estonia and, after observing the devastation of the church in that region, set up a visitation commission headed by Johannes Rudbeckius, the bishop of Västerås. Although he had previously been a notable resistor to the king's efforts to limit the independence of the church, the bishop was given the duty of reorganizing the clergy and restoring the collection of tithes. He was able to introduce the Swedish *Church Order* of 1571 to the region but made little progress in transforming the social attitudes of the local nobles, whom he criticized for mistreating the peasantry.[76] The influence of Lutheranism may still not have penetrated very deeply among many of the indigenous people, but it had been successfully established as the dominant confessional tradition in Livonia.

In Lithuania, by contrast, Lutherans were never more than a very small minority. German reformers had arrived there as early as the 1520s from Prussia and influenced some of the most powerful noble families, who welcomed an opportunity to be escape from papal influence. The period between 1555 and 1565 saw the greatest growth of the Reformation movement. The Radvilas, however, the leading

[75] August Westren-Doll, "Die schwedische Zeit in Estland und Livland," in *Baltische Kirchengeschichte*; Roberts, *Gustavus Adolphus*, 1:419–20.

[76] Westren-Doll, "Schwedische Zeit," pp. 90–95; Roberts, *Gustavus Adolphus*, 1:421–23.

family of the duchy, corresponded with John Calvin and led the way towards the establishment of a Reformed church in the region. After the union between Lithuania and Poland in 1569 Calvinists and Lutherans continued to enjoy some legal protections, but Vilna (Vilnius), the foremost city of Lithuania, became an important stronghold of the Counter-Reformation.[77]

Scandinavian Interventions in the Thirty Years War

After the successful conclusion of the Swedish-Polish War in 1629, Gustavus Adolphus was finally in a position to shift his attention to the west, to the war being waged between Protestants and Catholics in the Holy Roman Empire. Since 1623 he had been proposing the formation of a more effective Protestant League that would back him in a campaign to invade Bohemia and reverse the defeat that had been suffered there by Frederick V, the Elector Palatine. Gustavus Adolphus hoped both to prevent Catholic and imperial domination of northern Germany and to check any growth in the influence of Denmark, against whom he had fought a war as recently as 1611–1613. The war in Livonia interrupted Sweden's negotiations, and Denmark took up the cause that Sweden could no longer pursue.

King Christian IV of Denmark had a variety of reasons for entering the Thirty Years War. Since his territory of Schleswig-Holstein was within the boundaries of the Holy Roman Empire, he was as interested as the other German Protestant rulers in protecting princely liberties against interference by the Habsburg emperor. Involvement in the war also seemed necessary to offset Swedish ambitions in the region. Furthermore, the Danish king saw a tempting opportunity to advance his dynastic interests by conquering and secularizing ecclesiastical territories in northern Germany, which he planned to place under the control of his sons.[78] The Danish or Lower Saxon phase of the Thirty Years War (1625–1629), however, ended in a defeat that deeply eroded Denmark's reputation as the most important power in Scandinavia.

---

[77] Antanas Musteikis, *The Reformation in Lithuania—Religious Fluxuations in the 17th Century* (New York, 1988), pp. 37–53; Oskar Garstein, *Rome and the Counter-Reformation in Scandinavia—Jesuit Educational Strategy 1553–1622* (Leiden, 1992), pp. 234–65.

[78] Lockhart, *Denmark*, pp. 23–25.

Christian IV entered the war in 1625 expecting assistance from both England and France. When these allies became alienated from each other, the Danish king and Ernest, Count of Mansfeld, were ill-prepared to face the Catholic League army led by the Johann von Tilly. To make matters worse, these troops were newly supported by an additional imperial army under the command of Albrecht von Wallenstein. In August 1627 Christian IV was soundly defeated by Tilly at the battle of Lutter in Braunschweig. Wallenstein chased him back into his own kingdom and occupied most of Jutland. Christian IV was fortunate to reach a settlement with Wallenstein in the Peace of Lübeck of 1629, which allowed him to regain his lands in return for a promise never to interfere in the internal affairs of the empire again. In the same year, however, the emperor imposed the Edict of Restitution on the defeated Protestants, which called for the Lutherans to relinquish control of any territories in Germany that they had gained since 1555. In addition, Wallenstein took possession of Mecklenburg and sent troops to support Sweden's enemy, Poland. This signaled to Gustavus Adolphus that the emperor intended to challenge Sweden for control of the Baltic. Indeed, the emperor had honored Wallenstein with the title "General of the Oceanic and Baltic Seas". The Swedish king entered into a shaky defensive alliance with Denmark and landed his army in Pomerania in June 1630, quite conscious of the fact that it was the one-hundredth anniversary of the presentation of the Augsburg Confession.[79]

There may have been good political and economic reasons for Gustavus Adolphus' entrance into the war, but in his farewell declaration before departure, he portrayed his actions as a defense against imperial aggression. He also claimed to be entering the war, not for his own glory, but to "sustain the oppressed church".[80] Already as early as 1621 the clergy were preparing the people for eventual intervention in the war by sermons that portrayed Sweden as God's special nation, 'the true Israelites,' who could count on victory if they remain truly devoted to God. In the midst of the war Bishop Rudbeckius drew parallels in his preaching between Gustavus Adolphus and the biblical hero, Gideon. "Fear not, O little flock" (*Versage nicht du Hauflein klein*), a battle hymn

[79] Geoffrey Parker, *The Thirty Years War* (New York, 1984), pp. 71–81; Oskar Garstein, *Rome and the Counter-Reformation in Scandinavia—The Age of Gustavus Adolphus and Queen Christina of Sweden 1622–1656* (Leiden, 1992), pp. 18–35.

[80] On the motivations for the war, see Roberts, *Gustavus Adolphus* 2:417–25; Jill Lisk, *The Struggle for Supremacy in the Baltic 1600–1725* (London, 1967), pp. 68–69.

written in 1631, used this same image in conjunction with its call for courage and its assurance that "God is with us". A religious consciousness was also cultivated among the troops on the continent by the regular holding of daily prayers in every regiment at 4 p.m. Back in Sweden the people heard warnings in sermons about the approaching threat of persecution. Church and state cooperated in the creation of Days of Prayer, which were announced by edicts expressing alarm at how Roman Catholic idolatry was being reinstated in places where pure preaching of the word of God had been reclaimed.[81]

Gustavus Adolphus' successful march across Germany reached a highpoint at the battle of Breitenfeld in September 1631. After marching through Wittenberg to this small town north of Leipzig, the king's forces engaged the troops of Tilly and killed over seven thousand soldiers. The Protestant princes of Germany had, at first, been suspicious of the motives for Gustavus Adolphus' intervention in the war, but, after Breitenfeld, he was widely championed as a selfless savior. Over two hundred pro-Swedish broadsheets have survived from this era. They repeatedly proclaimed that Gustavus Adolphus was 'fighting for the Word of God". One poet emphasized the king's role in God's providential plan by noting that '*Deus*' spelled backwards is '*Sued*' (Sweden). Gustavus was compared to Joshua and his lineage was traced back, in one broadsheet, to Noah in order to portray him as a holy man. The king became known as the "Lion of Midnight". A broadsheet from 1630 gave this image apocalyptic associations by portraying him as a lion-warrior fighting a seven-headed dragon (Revelation 12).[82]

Gustavus Adolphus penetrated as far south as Bavaria and gained repeated victories until he moved back northward and fought the battle of Lützen, near Leipzig. On November 16, 1632, after the trumpeting of Luther's hymn, "A Mighty Fortress is our God," the king led his cavalry on a charge against the troops of Wallenstein. When he became separated from his escorts, he was surrounded, shot three times, and killed. As a result, the Protestant side lost its most successful leader, and Sweden faced a new dilemma at home because the 39 year-old king's sole heir was a daughter, who was still only six years old. Nevertheless, Sweden continued to participate in the war for another sixteen years,

[81] Nils Ahnlund, *Gustav Adolf the Great*, trans. Michael Roberts (New York, 1940), pp. 137, 267–75.

[82] John Roger Paas, "The Changing Image of Gustavus Adolphus on German Broadsheets, 1630–3," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 59 (1996), 205–44.

during which time it also fought a war against Denmark (1643–1645). Out of the settlement at war's end, Sweden gained control of the territory of western Pomerania and the secularized bishoprics of Bremen and Verden. Now possessing territories within the Holy Roman Empire, it also joined Denmark as a voting participant in imperial diets.[83]

The Church and the Absolutist State

In the immediate decades after the war both Denmark and Sweden evolved towards absolutist government as a result of their kings' skillful manipulation of class conflicts. Christian IV continued to rule Denmark until the end of the Thirty Years War and was succeeded by his son, Frederik III, in 1648. As a condition of his election Frederik III was forced to offer extensive power to the Council, which soon got Denmark involved in the First Anglo-Dutch War of 1652. The aim of his policy was to gain compensation for the territories in northern Germany that had been transferred to Swedish control by the Peace of Westphalia. This, in turn, led to war with Sweden, starting in 1657. Sweden inflicted heavy losses on Denmark, but Frederik III successfully prevented the occupation of Copenhagen in 1659, an event that enhanced his reputation among his people. When the war ended in 1660, Denmark's economy was in shambles. Frederik III summoned the *Rigsdag* to discuss ways of replenishing the royal treasury, but the nobles refused to accept any removal of their exemption from taxes. In response the representatives of the towns, led by the mayor of Copenhagen, and the clergy, led by Hans Svane, bishop of Zealand, accused the nobility of failing to respond to the country's need. These estates formed an alliance, "The Conjugated under the Liberty of Copenhagen," which called for taxation of all estates, the dismissal of the nobles on the Council, and an end to that body's role in electing Denmark's monarch. The lower estates were prepared to transfer all power to the king with the only conditions that he remain committed to Lutheranism and prepare a constitution for a hereditary monarchy. To reward the burghers and the clergy for their role in this bloodless revolution, the king gave the burghers the right to hold public office and the opportunity to acquire lands that had previously been reserved for the nobles. Bishop Svane

[83] Roberts, *Gustavus Adolphus* 2:674–773.

was given the title of archbishop, the first and only time this term was used for a church leader in Denmark. Frederik III replaced the Council with an eleven-person advisory board that included Archbishop Svane. In 1665 he issued the promised constitution, the *Royal Law*. It declared that the king stood above all human laws and was subject to the judgment of God alone. The only conditions placed on the monarch were the requirement that he confess the Lutheran faith and defend the territories that he had inherited.[84] Hans Wandel, professor of theology in Uppsala, provided theological justification for this new type of government in his book, *Jus regium*, which argued that absolutism was in full accord with the Bible.[85]

A similar result came about in Sweden though the process took longer and the chain of events was more convoluted. Axel Oxenstierna headed a regency government made up of members of the aristocracy from 1632 until 1644, when Gustavus Adolphus' daughter, Christina, reached adulthood. He continued his efforts to form an efficient bureaucracy in Sweden by implementing the "Form of Government" in 1634. Although this legislation reserved some offices for the nobility, it emphasized competence rather than birth as the primary criterion for appointments to the five colleges that made up the central administration. When Christina assumed power in 1644, she pressured Oxenstierna to work harder for an end to the wars against Denmark and in Germany. She also enhanced the power of the monarchy by playing off the nobles against the lower estates. She ran into trouble, however, because of the evolution of her religious sympathies. Humanistically-minded and trained in religion by Johannes Matthiae, one of the most open-minded of the Swedish bishops, she became increasingly uncomfortable with the strict orthodoxy espoused by Oxenstierna and most of the church leaders. Like her predecessor, Johan III, she also felt the appeal of the elaborate liturgy of the Catholic mass. She refused to bow to pressure to make the Formula of Concord a recognized confession of the Swedish Church. Intelligent and well-educated, Christina made her court a center for artists and scholars. Some of the foreign scholars she kept around were Catholic and, by 1651, she had decided herself to join the Church of Rome. Since law required that the Swedish monarch

[84] E. Ladewig Petersen and Knud Jespersen, "Two Revolutions in Early Modern Denmark," in *Politics and Society in Reformation Europe*, ed. E.I. Kouri and Tom Scott (New York, 1987), pp. 486–98; Benito Scocozza, *Ved afgrundens rand 1600–1700—Gyldendal og Politikens Danmarkishistorie*, 8, ed. Olaf Olsen (Copenhagen, 1989), pp. 229–29, 282–86.

[85] Schwarz Lausten, *Church History*, p. 133.

be Lutheran, she was faced with a difficult decision. Christina kept her conversion secret for a brief period but ultimately abdicated in 1654 and moved to Rome.[86]

Against strong opposition Christina had managed to get the Riksdag to recognize her German cousin, Karl, Count of the Palatinate, as heir if she never had any children. After her abdication, he ruled briefly as Karl X from 1654 to 1659. During his reign Sweden went to war again with Poland and Denmark (1657–1660). When he died at the age of 38 in 1660, Sweden had a regency government once more, until 1672, when Karl XI took the throne at the age of seventeen. It was during his long reign that Sweden, like Denmark, became an absolutist state.

Since 1660 Denmark had entered into a series of alliances with England, Brandenburg, and the Dutch in an effort to strengthen its position over against Sweden. Under pressure from its ally, France, Sweden entered a war against Brandenburg in 1672 that expanded into another conflict with Denmark. In the Scanian War the ill-prepared Swedish army could not hold onto all of its continental territories, and the navy also suffered major losses. However, when Denmark landed troops in southern Sweden in an effort to reconquer the province of Scania, which it had lost in 1658, King Karl XI personally led his troops to an important victory at Lund. In the peace treaties at the end of the war in 1679, France forced Denmark to give up most of the gains it had made at Sweden's expense.

Karl XI capitalized on his newly acquired reputation as a military hero and made a dramatic move to consolidate his power within Sweden. He blamed the regency government for getting Sweden into the Scanian War and, at a meeting of the *Riksdag* in 1680, he created a commission to investigate their misdeeds. Manipulating the lower estates' resentment of the nobility, he got them to support his right to rule without interference from the aristocratic Council. This shift of power was consolidated further in 1686, when the *Riksdag* declared that the royal family had been set by God and Nature, to "rule over us as absolute sovereign kings, whose will is binding on us all and who were responsible for their actions to no man on earth".[87]

Church leaders were not as directly involved in the political struggle in Sweden as they had been in Denmark, but religious sentiments also

[86] Oskar Garstein, *Rome…Gustavus*, pp. 547–68, 607–25, 700–21.

[87] A.F. Upton, "Sweden," in *Absolutism in 17th-Century Europe*, ed. John Miller (New York, 1990), p. 117.

played a role there in the establishment of absolutism. Karl XI's personal appeal was enhanced by his reputation as a model of Lutheran piety. For a long time, the clergy had also endorsed the idea that the king was a rightful guardian of both tables of the Decalogue to whom the people owed obedience as an authority ordained by God. More than any other factor, Lutheranism was a unifying force across the territories that Sweden controlled in Scandinavia, Germany and the eastern Baltic.[88]

*

Denmark and Sweden had become separate national entities at the very time that the Reformation era began. At that time they were both minor kingdoms, receptive to the new currents of religious thought flowing out of Germany. In the 150 years that followed each of them developed into a major political power whose influence spread beyond the northern territories they directly controlled. There were even moments of glory when Protestants on the continent were counting on them to rescue the reform movement from Catholic opponents that threatened to annihilate it. The ties to Germany were always strong, but Nordic Lutheranism developed a character all its own. The churches faced internal debates over Philippism and the influences of Roman Catholicism and Calvinism, as was the case in Germany, but were generally less inclined than the territorial churches on the continent to seek unity by a more precise formulation of doctrine. Their hesitance to accept the Formula of Concord is the clearest evidence of this fact. The Nordic churches produced significant systematic theologians from time to time, but more often they were presided over by bishops who devoted their energies to the creation of liturgies and church ordinances. Even more importantly, the churches were shaped by the dispositions of the Scandinavian monarchs. The character of Nordic Lutheranism ultimately owed much to their delicate balancing of political, economic, and religious interests. The Danish and Swedish kings were often bitter rivals of each other, but both royal lineages manifested a common commitment to maintaining social unity by the formation of national churches that were inclusive but also unmistakably Lutheran.

---

[88] Ibid., pp. 99–121; Robert Frost, *The Northern Wars*, pp. 208–23; Ingun Montgomery, "Die cura religionis als Aufgabe des Fürsten—Perspektiven der Zweiten Reformation in Schweden," in *Die reformierte Konfessionalisierung in Deutschland. Das Problem der 'Zweiten Reformation*,' ed. Heinz Schilling (Gütersloh, 1985), pp. 266–90.

LUTHERANISM IN THE KINGDOM OF HUNGARY

David P. Daniel

When Luther died in 1546, the Reformation had really only begun to transform the ecclesiastical landscape in the kingdom of Hungary. Sixty years would pass before the Peace of Vienna (1606) extended freedom of confessional allegiance to the nobility, towns, and military settlements in royal Hungary. When, as a precondition for his coronation, Matthias II Habsburg accepted articles of the Hungarian diet that ratified this peace, he recognized the legal existence of Protestant churches in Hungary according to which they could elect their own ecclesiastical administrators.

During the following sixty years, Lutherans struggled to preserve their often-reaffirmed right to exist, which was abrogated during the 1670s, the "sorrowful decade". Habsburg attempts to cleanse Hungary of "heretics and rebels" did not result in the extinction of Protestantism there. Foreign criticism, Turkish belligerence, and the hostility of many Hungarian nobles converged in the insurrection of Emmerich Thököly which compelled Leopold I to convene a diet in Sopron in 1681. It allowed Protestants to build churches in designated locations in royal Hungary and preserved them from the annihilation that had occurred in Bohemia.

This essay traces the complex, variegated development of Lutheranism in Hungary[1] between the synod of Ardud[2] in 1545 and the diet of Sopron in 1681. The former date marks the beginning of the

[1] For an overview of the literature, see Mihály Bucsay, *Der Protestantismus in Ungarn, 1521–1978, Ungarns Reformkirchen in Geschichte und Gegenwart, I. Im Zeitalter der Reformation, Gegenreformation und katholischen Reform* (Vienna, 1977), pp. 222–91; Márta Fata, *Ungarn, das Reich der Stephanskrone, im Zeitalter der Reformation und Konfessionalisierung, Multiethnizität, Land und Konfession 1500 bis 1700* (Münster, 2000), pp. 293–324.

[2] English equivalents are used for most given names of persons referred to in the text. Family names are provided in an appropriate native form. Place names are those currently used. This makes identification on a standard map easier. The use of Bratislava, a name dating from the 20th century for Pressburg, Prešporok, Pozsony or Posoniensis is anachronistic, but the use of one of the historic names would not make the location any clearer to the English speaking reader. A table comparing placenames is appended to this contribution.

confessional differentiation of the Reformation in Hungary. The second date marks the restoration of a legal, albeit very restricted, existence of Protestant churches in Habsburg Hungary. The focus is upon royal Hungary where the majority of the population became Lutheran and, to a lesser extent, on Transylvania, where Lutheranism became almost exclusively the religion of the Siebenbürgen "Saxons". It notes the complex interaction of social, economic and political interests, personal ambition, family connections and status, ethnic identity, and religious persuasion that shaped the development of Lutheranism in the kingdom. It sketches changes in the legal status of Lutheranism, the development of its ecclesiastical institutions, and the major theological disputes that defined Lutheran identity and preserved its integrity.

The Lutheran Reformation Penetrates Hungary

Luther's emphasis upon the priesthood of all believers, justification by faith alone, and the active participation of believers in the worship and administration of a congregation, was congruent with the attitudes of many urban leaders and nobles in Hungary at the beginning of the 16th century. The educational and moral concerns of humanism, which emphasized eloquence and piety, and the effective use of the "black art" of printing likewise contributed to the dissemination of the Reformation. Hussite warriors, who invaded northern Hungary during the first half of the 15th century or who served as mercenaries in the "black legion" of Matthias Corvinus, did not directly influence the initial spread of the Reformation into Hungary. Slovak Lutherans did use Hussite hymnbooks, translations of the Bible, and theological literature in Czech in the later 16th century.[3]

[3] Branislav Varsik, *Husiti a reformácia na Slovensku do žilinskej synody* (Bratislava, 1932). For surveys of the Hungarian Reformation its parts see works in note 1 and Tibor Fabiny, *Hope Preserved, The Past and Present of Hungarian Lutheranism* (Budapest, 1984); idem, *A Short History of Lutheranism in Hungary* (Budapest, 1997); Ludwig Binder, *Die Kirche der Siebenbürger Sachsen* (Erlangen, 1982); *Luther und Siebenbürgen, Ausstrahlungen von Reformation und Humanismus nach Südosteuropa*, eds. Georg and Renate Weber (Vienna, 1985); Katalin Péter, "Die Reformation in Ungarn," in *Intellectual Trends and Hungary*, 4th ed. Ferenc Glatz, (Budapest,1990); Katalin Péter, "Hungary," in *The Reformation in a National Context*, eds. Robert Scribner and Roy Porter (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 155–67; Sándor Payr, *Luther és a Magyararok* (Budapest, 1930); Ján Kvačala, *Dejiny Reformácie na Slovensku* (Liptovský sv. Mikuláši, 1935); Johannes Borbis, *Die evangelisch-lutherische Kirche Ungarns in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung* (Nördlingen, 1861); Stephan Linberger, *Geschichte*

Oral reports, letters, pamphlets, and books disseminated the views of Luther and other reformers. The circumstances, comments and actions of the earliest advocates of reform in Hungary strongly suggest that the Ninety-five Theses, his *On Good Works*, and his three "Reformation treatises" of 1520, were read in the kingdom shortly after publication. Evidence that people read and discussed Luther pre-dates the appearance of the first preachers of reform.[4] Patrons of local congregations, city councils or noblemen, sought preachers or teachers to introduce reform practices and teachings. Ethnic Germans from upper Hungary and Siebenbürgen began to attend the university in Wittenberg and spread Lutheran ideas primarily after 1530.

Early in the 1520s a circle of reform minded German humanists existed in Buda. It included Simon Grynaeus, Veit Winsheim, Johann Henckel, Johann Kressling, and Conrad Cordatus, a chaplain of Queen Mary Habsburg, the wife of King Louis II Jagellon. Cordatus and Kressling, too ardent in their support of Luther, left Buda in 1522 and preached in the mining cities of northern Hungary. In 1523 George of Brandenburg-Ansbach, who signed the Augsburg Confession, wrote Luther and posed several questions concerning the reception of the Lord's Supper in both kinds in private that may have been suggested by the queen. This group of German "heretics" declined in number and influence by 1525.[5]

Foreigners were a target of the Magyar national party and its *de facto* leader, the jurist Stephen Werbőczy. Like many Magyar gentry, he resented the economic and political privileges of the German towns and the foreign influences at court, feared Habsburg designs on Hungary, and desired a native, Magyar monarch.[6] They supported the ecclesiastical and secular authorities that moved to halt the importation

---

des Evangeliums in Ungarn sammt Siebenbürgen (Budapest, 1880); Sándor Payr, *A dunátúli evangélikus egyházkerület története* (Budapest, 1900).

[4] Daniel Veselý, *Dejiny krest'anstva a reformácie na Slovensku* (Liptovský Mikuláš, 2004), pp. 66–73; David P. Daniel, "Hungary," in *The Early Reformation in Europe*, ed. Andrew Pettegree (Cambridge, 1992), pp. 48–69.

[5] Bucsay, *Der Protestantismus in Ungarn*, pp. 42–48; Sándor Payr, *Cordatus Konrád budai pap Luther jó barátja* (Budapest, 1944); David P. Daniel, "Piety, Politics, and Perversion: Noblewomen in Reformation Hungary," in *Women in Reformation and Counter-Reformation Europe, Public and Private Worlds*, ed. Sherrin Marshall (Bloomington, IN, 1989), pp. 68–88, here pp. 68–76.

[6] Lajos Nyikos, "Erasmus und der böhmisch-ungarische Königshof," *Zwingliana* 7 (1927), 364–374; Jane de Iongh, *Mary of Hungary, Second Regent of the Netherlands* (London, 1958), pp. 61–65.

or possession of heretical publications and to stop the dissemination of the "German heresy".

In 1521 the papal bull against Luther was read in most important churches in the realm. In 1523 and 1525, the Hungarian diet resolved that, as heretics and foes of the Virgin Mary, Lutherans and their supporters were to be executed, their property confiscated, and Lutheran publications were banned.[7] In 1524 the archbishop of Esztergom dispatched a commission to the mining cities of north-central Hungary to search for and destroy publications by Luther and other reformers. The council of Sibiu in Transylvania was ordered to do the same. Although several heretic preachers and booksellers, along with their books, were executed, these laws were implemented sporadically.[8]

The Turkish invasion and the Reformation

The debacle at Mohács on 29 August 1526 decisively changed Hungary and made possible the more rapid penetration of the kingdom by reformation practices and ideas during the 1530s and 1540s. On a hot summer afternoon Hungary lost its king, two archbishops, five bishops, twenty-eight magnates, 500 nobles, and 18,000–20,000 soldiers.[9] Even though the Turks did not occupy central Hungary immediately, an exodus from the region began: to Hungary north of the Danube, to Transdanubia (Hungary south and west of the Danube), and eastward to the lands across the Tisza River and into Transylvania. The widowed Queen Mary and many courtiers fled to Bratislava on the left bank of the Danube. The Hungarian chamber that supervised and administered the income of the crown moved to the city in 1531 that was the capital of Hungary from 1536 to 1783. In 1543 the archbishop and chapter of Esztergom fled across the Danube to establish a residence in Trnava north of the new capital.[10]

---

[7] Karl Kuzmány, *Urkundenbuch zum Oesterreischisch-evangelischen Kirchenrecht* (Vienna, 1856), p. 110.

[8] Gerhard May, *Die evangelische Kirche Österreichs* (Göttingen, 1962), pp. 55–56; Rudolf Koštial, "L'ubietovskí martýri a banícka vzbura," *Historický Časopis* 5 (1957), 185–203; Peter Ratkoš, "Vznik povesti o L'ubietovských martyroch," *Historica, Sborník filozofickej fakulty univerzity Komenského* 15 (1964), 199–210.

[9] See Gyula Farkas, *Ungarns Geschichte und Kultur in Dokumenten* (Wiesbaden, 1955), pp. 45–48 for an extract of the report of Istvan Broderics, *De conflictu Hungarorum cum Turcis.*

[10] János Bak, "The Late Medieval Period, 1382–1526," in *A History of Hungary*, ed. Peter F. Sugar and Peter Hanák (Bloomington, IN, 1990), pp. 54–82, pp. 80–82.

Following Mohács and prior to the Council of Trent, the Roman Catholic church in Hungary was ill equipped to halt the spread of the Reformation. For nearly two decades, episcopal supervision was ineffective in royal Hungary and non-existent in the region controlled by the Turks. Only three bishops resided in the country when, after the Peace of Oradea (1538), Paul III consecrated five bishops for Hungary. Those named to historic sees in Turkish Hungary seldom if ever visited them. They occupied themselves with other ecclesiastical offices and served as royal bureaucrats or diplomats.

By the mid-16th century, adequately trained Roman Catholic clergy were in short supply throughout Hungary. Ecclesiastical offices, benefices, and vacant monasteries were controlled by lay administrators, legally secularized, or expropriated without much respect for legal procedures. Neither Ferdinand Habsburg nor John Zápolyai, whose alliance with the Turks led to his excommunication, seemed eager to nominate replacements for those who fell at Mohács.

The number of advocates of ecclesiastical reform increased during the 1530s as German-speaking reformers appeared in the cities of northern Hungary and Transylvania. The earliest Magyar reformers worked in towns or on the estates of the first nobles to tolerate or foster reform. Homegrown reformers emerged in a few cities and towns; others obtained Lutheran preachers from Moravia, Silesia, or Germany. Among the earliest Magyar reformers were former Observant Franciscans, Matthias Dévai, Emmerich Ozorai, Michael Sztárai, and Bencedi Szekely. [11] Others were Erasmian humanists, such as Benedict Komjáthi, Gabriel Pesti Miszér, and John Sylvester, who prepared the first translation of several books of the Bible into Hungarian. Many visited or were in contact with the Wittenberg reformers.[12]

In the absence of effective episcopal discipline, parish clergy and the laity supported changes advocated by the reformers. Communion in both kinds was common by the mid-16th century, as the episcopal visitations of the early 1560s ordered by Nicholas Oláh, archbishop of Esztergom, revealed. These visitations likewise confirmed that clerical concubinage, openly practiced during the later Middle Ages, was beginning

[11] Bucsay, *Protestantismus in Ungarn*, pp. 40–42.

[12] William Toth, "Luther's Frontier in Hungary," in *Reformation Studies, Essays in Honor of Roland H. Bainton*, ed. Franklin H. Littell (Richmond, VA, 1962), pp. 75–91; David P. Daniel, "Highlights of the Lutheran Reformation in Slovakia," *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 42 (1978), 21–27.

to be replaced by formal marriages of priests.[13] Several ecclesiastical authorities married and tacitly or openly expressed support for the Reformation. Emmerich Bebek, provost of Székesfehérvár, married in 1534 and was imprisoned briefly by the king. In 1542 John Horváth of Lomnice, the provost of Spiš, issued an edict against the Lutherans; two years later he resigned his office, converted, and married. His successor, the non-resident bishop of Pécs, Stanislav Váralyi, seems to have tolerated or at least was unable to halt the spread of Lutheranism into Spiš. In 1541 George Moeller, the senior of the fraternity of the pastors of the 24 Spiš towns, complained that it was almost impossible to find a Catholic priest to serve vacant parishes and in 1544 resigned and abandoned his opposition to reform.[14] In 1556 the administrator of the see of Nitra, Francis Thurzó, resigned his function, married, and supported Lutheranism on his extensive properties in northwestern Hungary.[15]

Hungary Tri-partitioned

The division of Hungary into three parts also promoted the spread and diversity of the Reformation.[16] On 10 November 1526 the Hungarian estates elected John Zápolyai king. A little over one month later, another smaller assembly of nobles elected Ferdinand Habsburg king.[17] For more than a decade the armies and diplomats of Ferdinand and Zápolyai struggled to settle their conflicting claims to the lands and authority of the "holy crown". Ferdinand's position improved when, prior to the Turkish siege of Vienna in 1529, Zápolyai swore an oath of fealty to the sultan at Mohács. After eleven truces were negotiated and promptly broken, emissaries of the two concluded a peace treaty at Oradea in February 1538. Each consented to the use of the royal

[13] Vojtech Bucko, *Reformné hnutie v arcibiskupstve ostrihomskom do r. 1564.* (Bratislava, 1939), critiqued by Branislav Varsik, "K počiatkom reformácie na Slovensku," *Historica Slovaca* 1/2 (1940/41), 304–05.

[14] J.P. Tomašik, *Andenken an die 300 jährigen Jubelfeier der evangelischen Gemeine in der k. Freistadt Leutschau (Levoča, 1844)*, pp. 28–38.

[15] Veselý, *Dejiny krest'anstva*, pp. 83–88.

[16] Peter F. Sugar, *Southeastern Europe under Ottoman Rule, 1354–1804* (Seattle, 1977), pp. 31–113.

[17] Ivan Mrva and David P. Daniel, "Slovakia during the Early Modern Era 1526–1711," in *A Concise History of Slovakia*, ed. Elena Mannová (Bratislava, 2000), pp. 105–112.

title by his rival. Each was to retain the territory they then controlled. Until he died, Zápolyai was to govern Transylvania and counties east of the Tisza River. Then they were to revert to the Habsburgs.

However, shortly before his death, Zápolyai's wife, Isabella Jagellon, gave birth to a son, John Sigismund. The Pauline monk and bishop of Oradea, "Frater" George Martinuzzi (Utejesnovič), and some Hungarian nobles ignored the Treaty of Oradea. They declared John Sigismund king of Hungary. The sultan, who opposed a possible reunification of northern and eastern Hungary, recognized this election. War resumed as Ferdinand attempted to enforce his treaty claims. However, he lacked the military and financial resources to invade Transylvania.

John Zápolyai had named Isabella as regent for their infant son. As treasurer of the principality, George Martinuzzi exercised considerable influence. Although he supported the claims of John Sigismund, Martinuzzi recognized that only a united kingdom could defeat the Turks. His complicated political machinations ultimately led both the Habsburgs and the Transylvanians to distrust him. Martinuzzi was murdered when a Habsburg army invaded Transylvania in 1551. Queen Isabella and John Sigismund temporarily accepted exile to estates in Silesia received from Ferdinand. They returned to the principality in 1556, where Isabella governed until her death in 1559. Although she remained a Roman Catholic, among her councilors were a Lutheran, Michael Csáki, and a Calvinist, Peter Petrovics.[18]

By the Treaty of Speyer of 1571 John Sigismund and Maximilian II accepted the existing division of Hungary. John Sigismund relinquished his claim to the crown of Hungary in exchange for recognition as prince in Transylvania proper and in parts of Hungary to the east and northeast of the Tisza, the so-called *partium*. When John Sigismund died six months later, the Transylvanian nobles again ignored treaty provisions, and elected as prince Stephan Báthory, who in 1575 was elected king of Poland. Báthory's election assured the continued legal autonomy of Transylvania that lasted until 1867.[19]

From the defeat at Mohács until the expulsion of the Turks at the beginning of the 18th century, the historic kingdom of Hungary did

[18] Béla Köpeczi et al., *Kurze Geschichte Siebenbürgens* (Budapest, 1990), pp. 247–57.

[19] This was more theoretical than actual for, after Leopold I issued the *Diploma Leopoldinum* and assumed the title "Prince of Transylvania" in 1691, almost all significant decisions concerning the principality were made in Vienna. See *History of Hungary*, pp. 83–100 and pp. 121–38.

not exist. Partitioned into three separate and distinct entities—royal or Habsburg Hungary, Turkish Hungary, and the principality of Transylvania—the relations between these entities were marked by periods of peace interspersed by indecisive but destructive armed uprisings, skirmishes of opposing forces, and all out military campaigns.

Ethnic diversity and distribution of the population in Hungary

When war between John Sigismund and Ferdinand resumed in 1541, the Turks occupied the Buda for the third time. They established there an administrative center (*eyelet*) for the parts of Hungary they controlled. The population of the city declined quickly. Within a decade only about 1000 Christians remained in Buda; by the beginning of the 17th century, there were probably less than 100. The Turks occupied the right bank of the Danube, from Pécs to Csákávár, Esztergom, and the territory between the Danube and the Tisza rivers and imported Serbs and Bosnians to serve as "Turkish" bureaucrats to control the local population.

The great plain between the Danube and the Tisza became the sultan's property. About 900,000 people out of the approximately 3.4 million inhabitants in the kingdom at mid-century lived in the occupied lands. The absence of their former landlords made possible increased self-rule within limits set by the Ottomans. Towns and villages flourished as international trade in livestock improved although both the Ottomans and their absentee Magyar landlords demanded the taxes due them.

The population of the autonomous territory of Transylvania was about 800,000. Romanians were the largest but least politically influential segment of the population, for the "union of three nations" of 1437 had recognized the equality of only three political "nations": the Siebenbürgen "Saxons," the Magyar freemen, and the Székely. The Magyars were the second most numerous segment of the population and most influential politically. The German population, which lived in and around the cities of Bistriţa, Braşov, Cluj, Mediaş, Sibiu, and Sighişoara, was the smallest group but was economically influential. The "golden charter" of Andrew II (1224) granted the Germans settlers, most from the lower Rhine, extensive privileges. They elected their own count, councils, and pastors. They had their own national "university," an organ of collective self-governance, which jealously guarded their privileges. Sibiu was its "seat" or administrative center.

A shift in trading patterns led to the stagnation of some "Saxon" towns during the 17th century. Magyars began to settle in some predominantly German towns and Magyars outnumbered Germans in economically flourishing Braşov at the end of the 16th century. The Székely, a self-governing Magyarphone ethnic group comprised of lesser nobles and soldiers in southeastern Transylvania, were important for the defense of the principality but could be equally disruptive when they felt their interests threatened.[20]

The western border of Ottoman-occupied Hungary stretched from the Drava and Sava rivers northward along Lake Balaton and then curved to the northeast to encompass Székesféhervár and Esztergom. The Habsburgs attempted to strengthen existing fortresses and establish new ones along this border. In the east, the episcopal and fortress city of Eger was close to the point where Turkish, Habsburg, and the Transylvanian-controlled territory converged. Frequent raids and indecisive retaliatory skirmishes devastated both sides of the ill-defined, porous northern border between Turkish and Habsburg Hungary.

For most of the 16th and 17th centuries, Habsburg Hungary was comprised of approximately two-dozen counties in western and northern Hungary with about 1.7 million inhabitants. The territory to the south and west of the Danube not occupied by the Turks comprised Transdanubia. Further south, much of the Banat of Croatia was under Turkish hegemony. The largest part of royal Hungary was comprised of all or parts of twenty counties lying north of the Danube and south of the northern arch of the Carpathians, eighteen of which are completely or partially in modern-day Slovakia. It was in royal or Habsburg Hungary that Lutheranism achieved its greatest expansion during the 16th century and suffered its greatest losses during the 17th.

During the Reformation era Hungary was more of an idea than a functional reality, but it was a powerful idea. From the treaties of Oradea (1538) and Speyer (1570) until the treaties of Sremski Karlovci (1699) and Satu Mare (1711), the Hungarian monarchs, nobility, and townsmen hoped that the kingdom would be re-united. They disagreed, however on how to reunite the kingdom, whether the monarchy was hereditary or elective, the extent of royal privileges and noble rights, the distribution of power and burden of taxation, and the question of

[20] Béla Köpeczi et al., *Kurze Geschichte Siebenbürgens*, pp. 228–32, 285–94; Peter F. Sugar, "The Principality of Transylvania," *History of Hungary*, pp. 121–37.

religious toleration and allegiance. The Turks skillfully manipulated these disagreements to keep the kingdom divided. The Roman Catholic hierarchy likewise exploited them to slow, then to halt, and finally to reverse the spread of the Reformation. But they could not eliminate it or its influence.

Towns in Hungary and the Reformation

The Reformation in Hungary initially was a "town" movement. The most important early centers of Lutheranism were the royal free cities and the mining towns of northern Hungary and the cities in Siebenbürgen. Lutheran ideas first circulated among townspeople who urged the adoption of Wittenberg reforms. The town leaders were determined that liturgical and ecclesiastical reforms would not endanger town privileges. Magistrates encouraged the development of confessional standards for Protestants in Hungary. They recognized that the substance of reforms and the principles of the faith that mandated and justified these reforms needed definition. Reformation was not to be a haphazard affair and was a far too important and potentially dangerous process to be left solely in the hands of the clergy. Like other changes in communal life, reformation was to be an orderly process, coordinated and guided by those in authority. Together with the pastors, they took the first steps to transform or establish administrative structures and town schools. The councils called reformist pastors and teachers, supervised the organization of local religious life, and supported regional meetings of clergy and lay leaders to establish common approaches to reform.[21]

The number of cities in Hungary and their population were modest in comparison to cities in Western Europe. There were about two-dozen chartered cities in the kingdom at the beginning of the 16th century. Most had only a few thousand inhabitants; several had less than a thousand. Directly under the king's authority, royal charters granted them commercial privileges and the right of self-governance according to law codes based upon German models. Towns elected their own city officials, including the city pastor. They paid taxes collectively to the king, could conduct regular markets, were obliged to maintain city

[21] Ferenc Szakály, *Mezővaros és reformácio. Tanulmányok a korai magyar polgárosodás kérdéséhez* (Budapest, 1995).

fortifications, and contribute to the defense of the kingdom. The fifteen royal free cities or boroughs included so-called "tavernical" towns (Buda, Košice, Bratislava, Sopron, Trnáva, Prešov, Bartfeld) and "personal" cities (Székesfehérvár, Esztergom, Levoča, Sabinov, Óbuda, Pest, Pécs, Szeged). The treasurer (*Tavernicus*) of the kingdom supervised and heard appeals from their courts using the law of Buda. The latter followed the law code of Szekesfehérvár and appealed to the chief justice, the personal legal representative (*Personalis*) of the monarch. Although the number of free cities in royal Hungary increased to thirty-nine by the end of the 17th century, the economic status and number of inhabitants of most declined.[22]

The Turks controlled Buda, Óbuda, Pest, Pécs, Székesféhervár, Esztergom, and Szeged. In the northeast, five royal free cities, Bardejov, Prešov, Košice, Levoča, and Sabinov, the *Pentapolitana*, formed a league in 1480 to protect their interests and to decide on common approaches towards important issues. The mining cities of northern Hungary comprised another significant group of cities. Like the free cities, they received numerous privileges during the Middle Age; their law codes were adaptations of the laws of German mining cities. The gold, silver, and copper they supplied were important sources of revenue for Hungarian monarchs. In 1466 seven "lower" Hungarian mining towns in the Hron River watershed (Banská Bystrica, Banská Štiavnica, Lubietová, Pukanec, Banská Bela, Nová Baňa, and Kremnica) formed the *Montana* league. Its administrative center was Kremnica, the seat of the royal mint. The German patricians jealously guarded their privileges and control of the town councils. Some also held citizenship in Silesian or Lusatian cities with which they had strong commercial ties.[23]

Further to the east, the so-called "upper" Hungarian mining towns (including Smolnik, Spišská Nová Ves, and Rožnava that are located in today's Slovakia) banded together in 1487 with an administrative center in Gelnica. The league dissolved by the end of the 16th century as most of the towns became the property of or came under the authority of noble landlords. There were important mining centers east of the Tisza and in the Transylvanian mountains. Controlled by the Transylvanian prince and local nobles, they did not develop town leagues.

---

[22] Mrva and Daniel, "Slovakia," pp. 149–53.

[23] Günther Frhr. von Probszt, *Die alten sieben niederungarischen Bergstädte im Slowakischen Erzgebirge* (Vienna, 1960).

The Spiš (Zips) region in northern Hungary was home to 43 German towns that had collectively received substantial privileges from the Hungarian monarchs. From this group emerged the province of the 24 four towns of Spiš that was rent in twain in 1412 when Sigismund pawned 13 of the wealthiest towns to Poland. They remained under Polish administration until the partitioning of Poland in the 18th century. The 11 remaining towns gradually lost their collective rights and came under the jurisdiction of Spiš castle.[24] In Siebenbürgen or Transylvania, the most important cities included Braşov, Sibiu, Cluj, Mediaş, Sighişoara, Turda, and Alba Iulia.

In addition to the cities with royal charters, defensive walls, and the right of self-governance, the landscape in Hungary was dotted with approximately 760 market towns (*oppida*) (some of which were as large if not larger than some cities) as well as countless villages and hamlets. They were most numerous—about 200 strong—in western Transdanubia and in the lowlands and river valleys of northern royal Hungary. They were far less numerous in the territory east of the Danube occupied by the Turks. Market towns lacked fortifications and were subject to the authority of the local landlord. During the 16th and 17th centuries, however, the importance of these towns as centers of artisan production increased at the expense of the royal free cities.

A substantial proportion of the inhabitants—almost all the patricians in the royal free cities in northern Hungary—were German. Their preeminence began to decline during the second half of the 16th century. In some towns, such Bratislava, Trnava, Nitra, Košice, and Cluj, the number of Magyar residents, immigrants from the regions occupied by the Turks, increased dramatically. With this, tensions between the various ethnic and religious groups increased. Likewise, in market towns on the Moravian border, along the Váh, and in the northern counties of Orava, Turiec and Liptov, the number of Slovaks and Czechs equaled or exceeded the number of German inhabitants. In northern Hungary Slovaks generally predominated in the country villages except in the lowlands just north of the Danube. Many of the market towns in royal Hungary came under the jurisdiction of Lutheran magnates during the second half of the 16th century and this promoted the spread of Lutheranism among the Slovak population in towns such as Skalica,

[24] Richard Marsina et al., *Spišské mestá v stredoveku* (Košice, 1974), pp. 33–89.

Trenčin, Hlohovec, Žilina, Turčiansky Martin, Sučany, Ružomberok, and Liptovský Mikuláš.

In market towns in the territory occupied by the Turks, in the region around Košice, and east of the Tisza River, Magyars predominated. Here Magyar reformers appeared quite early, especially on the estates of the Nádasdy family in Transdanubia and those of the Perényi in the Tisza River basin.

Nobles and the Reformation

Fleeing the Turks, some nobles took refuge on their estates in royal Hungary often bringing with them their Magyar, Slovenian, and Croatian serfs. This altered ethnic and religious relationships where they settled. In general, the immigrants from the southern territories did not adopt reformation practices or teachings. Displaced nobles attempted to acquire residences in the royal free and mining cities in northern Hungary and in Transylvania. This increased tensions between city governments and the nobility as urban and noble privileges, interests, and responsibilities collided.

Nobles were unwilling to relinquish their exemption from taxation or to conform to urban regulations. They little respected the authority of town councils or the customary rules enshrined in town charters. Both groups regularly appealed to the diet and the king to redress their real and perceived grievances. In 1546 the diet exempted nobles whose property was under Turkish control from paying town taxes. In 1563 the diet granted nobles the right to purchase property in towns. City councils opposed these and other similar laws but their collective vote had little influence in the diet. They assumed, rightly, as it turned out, that the privileges and influence of the towns in the kingdom would be curtailed. During the 17th century, the nobility challenged the economic significance and marginalized the political influence of the towns. In 1647 the diet held that nobles retained all noble privileges and rights even in the cities. Refugee nobles sought to enforce their seigniorial rights in Turkish Hungary.[25]

[25] Mrva and Daniel, "Slovakia," pp. 141–49.

Ferdinand I and his Habsburg successors attempted to rationalize the essentially medieval system of governance in both Bohemia and Hungary. This often challenged the power and privileges of the estates. In Vienna Ferdinand established for his lands a privy council, a court chamber or treasury, a court chancellery, Hungarian and Bohemian chancelleries, and a court military council. These agencies implemented and enhanced royal authority. Since many Hungarian nobles refused to participate in the work of the Hungarian chancellery, its staff was comprised primarily of Habsburg loyalists. In 1540 Ferdinand established a governor's council for Hungary in Bratislava led by the chancellor, the archbishop of Esztergom. It exercised some of the powers of the palatine but lacked his authority in financial and military matters.

The nobles were determined to resist any limitation of their political and economic privileges. During the second half of the 16th century nobles comprised about 4–5% of the population of Habsburg Hungary and included individuals of Magyar, Slovak, Serbian, Polish, and other ethnic origins. They comprised the majority in the diet, deliberations of which were recorded in Latin. Nobles, exempt from most taxes and fees, could not be arrested without a court order. They exploited their rights as ecclesiastical patrons. The "golden bull" of 1222 established their right to exercise the *jus resistendi*, the right to resist by force a king who acted illegally to curb noble rights and privileges.

First in prestige and authority among the magnates was the palatine (*palatinus, nádor*). On the one hand, he represented the interests of the king and administered the country during the monarch's absences, which were frequent. On the other hand, the nobles considered him a representative of noble interests. Since he could act with considerable independence, the Habsburgs often left the office vacant or transferred its authority to a governing council while the nobles insisted upon electing a palatine. After Thomas Nádasdy died in 1562, the office of palatine remained vacant for 46 years.

Although all nobles were theoretically equal in status, by the mid-16th century many nobles were not much better off than wealthy peasants save for their titles and privileges. The preponderance of power in the kingdom during the era of the Reformation and Counter-Reformation rested with the magnates. Their identity, ethnic origin and number varied. Some families died out while others incurred such debts that they became insignificant. They were replaced by new nobles, whose military skills, familial ties, and pursuit of advancement matched their ambitions. The highest offices in the kingdom generally were in the

hands of about 35 families. Less than two dozen families controlled over 40% of the land. From this group came the dozen or so families who, at any one time, comprised the real political elite in Habsburg Hungary. They owned vast estates, served as counts (*comes*), the chief feudal lords of a county or castle district, as assistant county heads, or held the highest state offices. They had judicial and administrative responsibilities and maintained private armies, *banderia*, to defend the country and their own interests. They exploited military conflicts, family connections, and political feuds to acquire wealth, influence, prestige and, ultimately, power. The leading noble families were related to one another; religious differences were not necessarily an impediment if an advantageous political or marital alliance could be concluded.[26]

During the 16th century noble patrons of the Lutheran movement generally came from relatively new magnate and upper gentry families in royal Hungary. Some corresponded with Lutheran theologians in Germany. They approved calls to Lutheran pastors, established local schools, and endowed foundations or granted individual scholarships that enabled talented students to study abroad, especially at Wittenberg. Some sponsored the publication of devotional, liturgical, and other theological and secular literary works, at home or abroad. Many took active interest in local religious affairs, and not a few were conversant with broader theological issues. Their attitudes often affected positions taken by regional synods.

Among supporters of Lutheranism in royal Hungary were magnates of the Perényi, Thurzó, Illésházy, Révai, and Nádasdy families, all of whom, except for the Perényi, had attained magnate status during the early 16th century. The Balassi, Dersffy, Kostka, Horváth Stančič, Nyáry, Ungnad/Sonnegg noble families also supported the Lutheran cause. They generally were loyal to the Habsburgs, who they hoped would free Hungary from Turkish occupation.

On the other hand, magnates opposing the Habsburgs and the leaders of the insurrections of the estates during the 17th century primarily came from northeastern Hungary or Transylvania. Among them were Catholics—Zápolyai, Báthory, Wesselényi, Francis II. Rákoczi—and Reformed—Bocskai, Bethlen, George I. Rákoczi, and Emmerich

[26] R.J.W. Evans, *The Making of the Habsburg Monarchy, 1500–1700, An Interpretation* (Oxford, 1979), pp. 235–53.

Tököly. They were willing to ally with the Turks and other foreign powers to cast off the Habsburg yoke.

What the magnates and nobles gave, they could also take away. Magnate families that remained Lutheran for more than three generations were rare. Some families died out, and their property reverted to the crown, or it was acquired by Catholic relatives. During the second quarter of the 17th century, most descendants of Lutheran magnates converted to Roman Catholicism in order to retain their status. Others converted to achieve the status of magnate and enter the inner circles of power and influence open to a select few. The synergy of the Counter-Reformation, colloquial preaching, and persuasive polemics, combined with probable social and political advantage and palpable economic enrichment, induced many to convert. These so-called *convertiti* vigorously exercised their patronage rights, confiscating Lutheran and Reformed church buildings on their estates, expelling non-Catholic pastors and teachers. This did not immediately or necessarily change the confessional allegiance of the populace. At the end of the 17th century Protestants still seem to have outnumbered Roman Catholics in the kingdom.

Early organizational efforts of Lutherans

The "confessionalization"[27] of the evangelical humanist reformation in Hungary during the 16th century was connected with the formation of associations of clergy from cities and towns. Some of these associations (*contuberniae*, fraternities, chapters, and seniorats) existed within the church in Hungary during the late Middle Ages, especially in predominantly German areas. They were based upon traditions of ecclesiastical organizations in the Rhineland and Lowlands. They were not unlike a "guild" for the clergy, who fraternally associated to protect their interests from encroachments by either ecclesiastical or secular lords. They provided guidance, support, and sought to maintain discipline among the members. Throughout the 16th century they continued to pay the

[27] Here the term "confessionalization" is used in its primary sense to denote the process of preparing and adopting confessions of faith rather than to designate their use as a means of social or political control.

catedraticum or church tax as well as other obligatory emoluments to appropriate ecclesiastical authorities.

These associations were agencies of reform, shaping and giving theological substance to the more practical and formal changes advocated by town councils or nobles. They approved articles governing the life of member clergy and formulated common approaches towards liturgical practices and ecclesiastical life including the celebration of the sacraments, the significance and form of auricular confession, the use of images and vestments and which holidays to observe. These *contuberniae* provided the basic institutional structures for Lutheran and Reformed churches in Hungary, especially before they received legal recognition as churches independent of Roman prelates.[28]

Church life in Siebenbürgen during the Middle Ages was organized and administered by approximately 15 individual chapters in the diocese of Alba Iulia. They were directed by elected deans usually resident in an important town. At the beginning of the 16th century these chapters created a "university" of clergy and elected a general dean, who resided in Mediaş. Although exempt from direct supervision by the bishop, the chapters at Sibiu and Braşov allied themselves with this university of the clergy.

The Reformation among the Germans in Transylvania was implemented by the concerted action of both the "national" and "clerical" universities. Reform sentiment appeared during the late 1520s and 1530s in the largely German city of Sibiu and in Braşov. A Simon Siebenbürger enrolled at Wittenberg in 1530, the first from Transylvania, and was the rector of the school in Braşov five years later. In 1536 Matthias Ramser, who had introduced reforms in the city of Sabinov in northern Hungary, became the city pastor of Sibiu. During the 1540s reform practices were also introduced by Michael Fleischer in Bistriţa, by Lucas Roth in Sighişoara, and by Bartholomew Altenberger in Mediaş.[29]

The crucial step in establishing the Reformation among the Siebenbürgen Germans was taken by a layman, the humanist John Honter, a member of the inner council of Braşov. The epitome of a magisterial reformer, he had studied in Vienna and Cracow, worked in Basel

---

[28] Kvačala, *Dejiny reformácie*, pp. 81–93.

[29] Karl Reinerth, *Die Gründung der evangelischen Kirchen in Siebenbürgen* (Cologne, 1979), pp. 23–68.

for several printers and was acquainted with the views of the south German and Swiss reformers as well as Luther's. In 1542 the "papist mass" was abolished after the Transylvanian estates had confirmed the right of each of the three "nations" to govern their own affairs through their own national "assemblies" and allowed the secularization of some church properties. The following year Honter published his guide for implementing reform in Sibiu and the county of Bars. Translated by Lukas Trappolder into German, it was used by Matthias Ramser in Sibiu and even issued with an introduction by Melanchthon in Wittenberg. Despite the lack of formal theological training, Honter replaced Jeremias Jekel as the town pastor in 1545. In 1547 Honter, Matthias Glatz, Valentine Wagner, Caspar Heltai, Albert Kirchner, Lukas Roth, and Bartholomew Altenburg met in Sibiu to prepare a church order for the Germans in Siebenbürgen.[30] Formally adopted by the national "university" in 1550, it declared the adherence of the German "university" to the Wittenberg reform movement.[31] Three years later Paul Wiener, who came from Slovenia and had replaced Ramser as pastor in Sibiu, was elected the first superintendent or bishop of the Siebenbürgen Saxon Lutheran Church.

In northern Hungary the fraternity of the pastors of the 24 Spiš towns reflected but was not identical with the composition of the political organization of the province of the 24 towns. Based upon a constitution dating from 1298, this fraternity elected an administrator or senior from their ranks, maintained clerical discipline, and protected the material interests and privileges of the secular clergy from encroachments by the provost of the Spiš chapter. By the middle of the 16th century the fraternity had become Lutheran. Seven more Lutheran pastoral fraternities or seniorats were established in Spiš before the end of the century. They were formally under the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Spiš provost until the synod of Spišské Podhradie in 1614.[32]

---

[30] Reinerth, *Gründung*, pp. 87–121.

[31] Hermann Pitters, "Luther und die Anfänge der Reformation in der Siebenbürgisch-Sächsischen Kirche. Siebenbürgische Beziehungen zu Wittenberg in der 1. Hälfte des 16 Jahrhundert," in *Gefördert und Gesegnet: Die Kirche der Siebenbürger Sachsen und Ihr lutherisches Erbe*, eds. Hermann Pitters and Gerhard Schullerus, *Beiheft der kirchlichen Blätter* 4 (1983), 37–57. See also Ludwig Binder, *Gründlagen und Formen der Toleranz in Siebenbürgen bis zur Mitte des 17. Jahrhunderts* (Cologne, 1976); Oskar Wittstock, *Johannes Honterus der Siebenbürger Humanist und Reformator* (Göttingen, 1970).

[32] Viktor Bruckner, *A reformáció a ellenreformáció története a Szepességen* (Budapest, 1922).

Lay supporters of the Reformation took the lead in forming two new seniorats in northern Hungary. The *Montana* seniorat of the seven lower Hungarian mining cities developed in 1536 when Paul Várdai, archbishop of Esztergom, ordered a canonical visitation to investigate the religious situation in the mining cities. The city council of Kremnica, as president of the *Montana* league, called a meeting of lay representatives and clergy of the league to formulate a common stance towards reforms. From this meeting emerged the *Montana* seniorat. During the 16th century the council of Kremnica or the pastor of Banská Štiavnica normally convened meetings of the seniorat. It was difficult to rotate the position of senior as initially planned since some cities left the position of town pastor vacant and engaged preachers that received a salary half that of a pastor.[33]

Four years later Bardejov, Sabinov, and Prešov adopted regulations for implementing reform. The articles of 1540 probably were drafted by Leonard Stöckel, rector of the school in Bardejov, just returned from nearly a decade in Germany. They call for the pure preaching of the gospel and the administration of the sacraments according to Holy Scripture, the Augsburg Confession, and Melanchthon's *Loci Communes*; ceremonies were to be in languages understood by worshipers, and Luther's catechism was to be taught in Slovak. They opposed the Anabaptists and Anti-Trinitarians that had appeared in eastern Hungary. The town pastors were to implement the articles in the villages belonging to each city.[34]

Six years later, meeting in Prešov, the five royal free cities of northeast Hungary (Prešov, Sabinov, Bardejov, Košice, and Levoča) established a seniorat. Michael Radašin, raised in Istria, pastor in Bardejov, was elected archdeacon or senior. The synod adopted sixteen articles on theological and practical matters. The first article declared their adherence to the Augsburg Confession and Melanchthon's *Loci Communes*. Other articles concerned the administration of the sacraments, matters of ceremony, saints' days and festivals, visitations by the archdeacon, the relationship between the magistrates and the administration of the churches, excommunication, the pastoral office, the relationship

[33] Pavol Križko, *Dejiny banskomestkého seniorátu* (Liptovský Mikuláš, 1948).

[34] Andrej Hajduk, "Šarišské zákony (článký) z roku 1540," in *Acta Collegii Evangelici Prešoviensis VII, Miscellanea Anno 1999*, eds. Peter Kónya and René Matlovič (Prešov, 2000), pp. 259–64.

between the local pastors and the senior, and what would be taught in municipal schools.[35]

Although town leaders initiated the establishment of these two seniorats, almost all of the nearly 40 Lutheran seniorats established in royal Hungary during the 16th century followed the model of the fraternity of the pastors of the 24 Spiš cities. A noble supporter of reform might summon the clergy to meet, but the clergy organized a seniorat and sought common approaches to reform. The organization of a superintendency or bishopric was another matter.

The clergy of a seniorat normally gathered twice each year to discuss theological and pastoral problems, adjudicate disputes and to resolve differences in practices and teaching. Already in the 1540s, these regional synods of seniorats revealed the diversification of reformation theology and practice in Hungary, even among those who declared support for the Wittenberg reforms.

Wittenberg and the confessional diversification of the Reformation in Hungary

The ethnic and confessional differentiation of the reform movement in Hungary reflected the appearance of Anabaptists during the late 1520s and 1530s, of supporters of Helvetic reform during the 1540s and 1550s, and of Anti-Trinitarians during the 1550s and 1560s. Ethnic diversity within the reform movements also emerged as Magyar-speaking reformers appeared in Transdanubia and in the region east of the Tisza River during the late 1530s and 1540s and as the first Slovaks in northern Hungary began to adopt the Lutheranism of their German neighbors during the 1540s and 1550s.

Matthias Dévai, later called the Hungarian Luther, worked alongside John Sylvester Erdösi on the estates of Thomas Nádasdy in Sárvar. There, in 1538, he prepared a grammar of the Hungarian language and a Hungarian adaptation of Luther's Small Catechism. After visiting Wittenberg and Basel in 1541, Dévai served as court preacher for the

[35] József Hörk, *A sáros-zempléni evangélikus esperesség története* (1885); Miloslava Bodnárová, "Die Reformation in den ostslowakischen königlichen Städten in der ersten Hälfte des 16. Jahrhunderts," in *Die Reformation und ihre Wirkungsgeschichte in der Slowakei*, eds. Karl Schwarz und Peter Švorc (Vienna, 1996), pp. 22–35.

magnate Peter Perényi in Szikszó and then in Miskolc and Debrecen under the patronage of Casper Drágffy and his wife, Anna Báthory.

Dévai was eclectic in his theology,[36] as were many of his contemporaries including Benedict Komjáthy and Michael Sztárai. Dévai may have prepared the theses for a conference of clergy on 20 July 1544 in Oradea Mare, which declared that the spiritual body and blood of Christ are present, communicated, and dispensed to believers in the Lord's Supper. One year later, 29 pastors from the Magyarphone region to the northeast of Oradea Mare met in Ardud. This synod approved twelve articles to indicate how their views differed from those of Roman Catholics as well as those who repudiate infant baptism. They maintained that justification was through faith without the works of the law. Good works were the fruit of justification. In the Lord's Supper the elements of bread and the wine offer the recipient the body and blood of Christ. Confession, which is a necessary preparation for admission to the Lord's Supper, is threefold: confession to God and to one's brother is a divine mandate; auricular confession, however, is a custom and can be maintained, but without the requirement that individual sins be confessed. The articles reject episcopal succession and declare that Christ alone is the head of the Church. The twelfth and final article indicates that in all other questions of faith they are in agreement with the confession of the true church presented in Augsburg in 1530.[37]

The decision of these synods sought to define more precisely the theology that justified implemented reforms. They demonstrate that many, if not most, of the early supporters of the Reformation felt a kinship with the Wittenberg reformers and were called "Lutheran" even if their theological stance may have differed with that of the Wittenberg reformer. They perceived a congruency between their own theology and practice and the theology and reforms advocated by Luther and Melanchthon. Even before the death of Luther but especially during the second half the century, Melanchthon's influence upon the Reformation in Hungary equaled or even exceeded Luther's while among the Reformed only Heinrich Bullinger surpassed his influence until the last quarter of the 16th century.

---

[36] Istvan Botto, *Dévai Mátyás, a Magyar Luther, Dévai helvét irányba hajlásának problémja* (Budapest, 1990).

[37] Johannes Ribini, *Memorabilia augustanae confessionis in regno Hungariae I* (Posoni, 1787), pp. 67–70; Mathias Szlavík, *Die Reformation in Ungarn* (Halle, 1884), pp. 35–36.

Melanchthon was well informed about the situation in Hungary. Like some Hungarians, he considered the Turkish occupation of Hungary to be God's scourge for Roman idolatry. He viewed Hungary as the bulwark of European Christendom and criticized the German princes for failing to provide it with the military assistance it needed. Melanchthon favored the founding of the Hungarian bourse or *coetus* in Wittenberg by Geoge Kakas and 16 Magyar students in 1555.[38] It became the focal point of the academic and social life of the ethnic Magyars at Wittenberg. Until it closed in 1613, it was a purely Magyar organization; no German or Slav from Hungary was a member. From its ranks came many leaders of the Magyar Reformed community throughout Hungary. In many ways the synchronous emergence of the theological and ethnic diversity of the Reformation in Hungary can be traced back to the Wittenberg connection—or in some cases, the lack thereof.

Melanchthon's significance for the reformers in Hungary can hardly be over-estimated. He was the humanist *praeceptor Germaniae*, the mentor and model for two generations of schoolmasters in Hungary, from whose ranks came many pastors. He befriended many of the 442 students from Hungary who studied in Wittenberg during his lifetime. In 1549 he held a series of Sunday sermons in Latin for Magyar students who had difficulty following German sermons. The compilation of his writings known as the *Corpus Philippicum* or *Misnicum* was an essential theological resource for reformers in all regions of Hungary. After Luther's death he inherited the mantel of leadership in Wittenberg, where Philippist and even "Crypto-Calvinist" views predominated for more than a quarter-century. The more than 1,000 students from Hungary who attended the university during the 16th century could not avoid encountering Melanchthon, his writings, or ideas. The diverse theological formulations that Melanchthon employed first encouraged, then troubled, and ultimately divided the evangelical reform movement in Hungary.

---

[38] Géza Szabó, *Geschichte des Ungarischen Coetus an der Universität Wittenberg, 1555–1613* (Halle, 1941); Katalin Keveházi: *Melanchthon és a Wittenbergben tanult magyarok az 1550-es evektöl 1587-ig (Adalékok Melanchthon magyarországi recepciójának elsö évszázadához)* (Szeged, 1986); *Melanchthon und Europa 1. Teilband, Skandinavien und Mittelosteuropa*, eds. Günther Frank and Martin Treu (Stuttgart, 2001); see especially Robert Kolb, "Das Erbe Melanchthons im Bekenntnis der ungarischen Bursa an der Universität Wittenberg (1568)," pp. 223–39; Agnes Ritook-Szalay, "Warum Melanchthon? Über die Wirkung Melanchthons im ehemaligen Ungarn," pp. 273–84; David P. Daniel, "Das umstrittene Erbe Melanchthons in Südosteuropa," pp. 259–72; Heinz Scheible, "Melanchthons Beziehungen zum Donau-Karpaten-Raum bis 1546," in *Luther und Siebenbürgen*, pp. 36–70.

Tridentine Catholicism and Reformation Confessions

After Luther's death the forces of the league of Smalcald were defeated in April 1547. The league for the defense of Bohemian liberties collapsed in July. This gave Ferdinand an opportunity to deal with religious diversity in Hungary. He summoned the diet to Bratislava in 1548. It ordered the restoration of religious rites to their pristine norm and banned Anabaptists and Sacramentarians. Some of the nobles and the cities who consented to the law apparently believed that Ferdinand would not challenge their rights as ecclesiastical patrons since he had specifically recognized their privileges in a diploma issued in September 1548. However, that is precisely what Ferdinand did. He ordered commissions to the cities to root out "heresy".

In 1549 a royal commission came to ferret out Anabaptists and Sacramentarians and to assess the doctrine and practice of the five royal free cities in the diocese of Eger. A confession previously prepared by the senior, Michael Radašin of Bardejov, was considered too strongly worded. His colleague, Leonard Stöckel, rector of the school in Bardejov, was entrusted with compiling a revision, adopted as the *Confessio Pentapolitana.* Radašin presented it to the royal commissioners on 22 August 1549.[39]

During the 1550s, as the archbishop of Esztergom, Nicholas Oláh, began to implement Tridentine reforms, he convened synods, ordered visitations, and prepared a confession sent to the clergy in his archdiocese. In August 1557 he summoned the pastors of the seven mining cities to meet at his residence in Trnava and accept these articles. They refused to attend this and other meetings called by the archbishop or his archdeacons. They adopted instead a defense of their theology and practice prepared by Ulrich Cubicularius, a native Bruchsal in Baden, pastor in Banská Štiavnica. Meanwhile, the representatives of the cities petitioned Ferdinand to recognize that their theology and practices were in accord with the confession recognized by the Peace of Augsburg. Ferdinand responded that the Augsburg Confession had

[39] Zoltán Csepregi, "Konfessionsbildung und Einheitsbestrebungen im Königreich Ungarn zur Regierungszeit Ferdinands I". *ARG* 94 (2003), 243–75. Csepregi has also published a critical edition of the Latin texts of the three Lutheran confessions of northern Hungary; Zoltan Csepregi, *Synopsis trium confessionum evangelicarum in Hungaria septemtrionali* (Budapest, 2003). For a Slovak translation of the confessions see Andrej Hajduk, *Tri vyznania viery na Slovensku v 16. storočí* (Zvolen, 1990).

no validity in Hungary. He decreed that all clergy in the archdiocese respect the authority of the archbishop and destroy heretical writings. The cities responded by adopting a confession prepared by Cubicularius. The *Confessio Montana* or *Heptapolitana* of 1559 utilized, but did not slavishly follow, the ten-year old *Confessio Pentapolitana*. It lacks an article on free will, supplements the statement on the church from the *Pentapolitana* with a more detailed definition, and states that the liturgy is to be conducted decently and in proper liturgical attire. The conclusion expresses a willingness of the signatories to seek peace in the church by discussing disputed points of doctrine and practice.[40]

Oláh received but did not recognize the confession. Rather, he sought to redress the critical shortage of trained Catholic priests and impose clerical discipline. The visitations he ordered during the early 1560s indicated that many priests celebrated communion in both kinds and had married or were living openly with a concubine. In 1561 he installed representatives of the newly established Society of Jesus at his residence in Trnava in order to prepare a new generation of priests. When, in 1564, Pope Pius IV allowed communion in both kinds in Bohemia and Hungary, Oláh tolerated this in his archdiocese, assuming that this would ease the return of Lutherans to Catholicism.[41] His efforts met with little immediate success. Following a fire in 1567, the Jesuits left Trnava; after Oláh died the following year, the archbishopric was vacant for 23 years.

In 1569 the Spiš provost, Gregory Bornemissa, bishop of Oradea, threatened to impose restrictions upon the fraternity of the pastors of the 24 Spiš towns. Cyriacus Koch or Obsopaeius, consenior in Spišské Podhradie, and Valentin Megander, pastor in Spišská Nová Ves, prepared a confession that a consultation of the clergy accepted on 26 October 1569. The *Confessio Scepusiana* is the least original of the three confessions of the Lutherans in Hungary and reiterates whole passages from the *Confessio Montana*. These confessions, the only formal corporate confessions produced by Lutherans in royal Hungary during the Reformation era, were moderate in their approach to the reform of doctrine and emphasized the "catholicity" of their views as they sought toleration.

There were those, however, who demanded more fundamental and extensive theological changes. During the 1540s Michael Radašin and

[40] Križko, *Dejiny banskomestského seniorátu*, pp. 31–61.
[41] Vojtech Bucko, *Reformné hnutie*; idem, *Mikuláš Oláh a jeho doba* (Bratislava, 1940).

Leonard Stöckel accused Dévai of promulgating Sacramentarian views. Then, during the 1550s and early 1560s, Radašin and Stöckel rejected views promoted by the Osiandrian Matthias Lauterwald, a preacher in Prešov, of Francis Stancarus, and the Helvetic Reformed theologians Gregor Szegedi, Martin Kálmánscehi, and Paul Thurius.[42]

Lutheranism was challenged by the Helvetic Reformed and Anti-Trinitarians particularly in eastern Hungary and Transylvania, where the decisions of a series of synods confirmed that three separate and distinct reformation movements were emerging in Hungary; Lutheran, Helvetic Reformed, and Anti-Trinitarian. At the synod of Beregszász in 1552, those who opposed the removal of altars and supported the views of Johannes Brenz were criticized. Two years later, 89 clerics meeting in Óvári, declared support for Lutheran teaching concerning the Lord's Supper and ordered the reintroduction of the use of the host, auricular confession, and celebrations of the older festivals. The decision concerning the removal or retention of altars was referred to the magistrates. One year later, a synod in Ardud condemned Demeter Tordai for replacing the altar in his church with a communion table.[43]

The various confessions adopted by the Reformed in eastern Hungary and Transylvania between 1559 and 1570 clearly indicate the differences between the Lutherans and the Reformed concerning the Lord's Supper, Christology, and liturgical practices including the use of altars and pictures in churches. The confession on the Lord's Supper of Târgu Mureş of 1559; the first Reformed confession written in Hungarian, the *Confessio Catholica* of 1562[44] prepared by Peter Melius Juhász; and the confession of Csenger, prepared during the late 1550s but published in 1570, clearly indicate that the Magyars had "turned Swiss".[45] The Lutheran magnate in the region, Gabriel Perényi, attempted to expel non-Lutheran pastors, but after his death the pastors reiterated their

[42] Andrej Hajduk, "Život a dielo Michala Radašína," *Acta Collegii Evangelici Presoviensis* 3 (Prešov, 1998), pp. 43–49; Stephen Linberger, *Geschichte des Evangeliums in Ungarn sammt Siebenbürgen* (Budapest, 1880), pp. 34–36.

[43] Bucsay, *Protestantismus in Ungarn, I*, pp. 104–107.

[44] Also known as the *Confessio Debrecinensis* or the *Confessio Agrovallensis*. See *Ostmitteleuropas Bekenntnisschriften der Evangelischen Kirchen A. und H. B. des Reformationszeitalters III/1, 1564–1576*, eds. Peter F. Barton and Lászlo Makkai (Budapest, 1987), pp. 127–132, 261–70.

[45] David P. Daniel, "Calvinism in Hungary, the theological and ecclesiastical transition to the Reformed faith," in *Calvinism in Europe, 1540–1620*, eds. Andrew Pettegree et al. (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 205–30.

stance in a *Modus Concordiae* that made the use of Calvin's catechism obligatory.

Against the growing influence of the Reformed, Bishop Matthias Hebler, pastor in Sibiu, prepared a brief confession on the Lord's Supper in 1561 that reiterated the Lutheran understanding of the sacrament. At a synod in Mediaş in 1572, the German Lutheran pastors of Transylvania adopted a theological consensus[46] prepared by the Lutheran bishop, Luke Ungler of Birthalben. This formally established the Augsburg Confession as the theological standard for Lutherans in Transylvania. It did not resolve the continuing problem of Philippism.

A series of decisions by the Transylvanian diets in Turda made possible the formation of a legally separate and distinct Lutheran Church of the Siebenbürgen Saxons. In 1550 the diet of Turda recognized the right of the Saxon "university" to regulate ecclesiastical practices. In 1556 the diet secularized property and income of the Catholic sees and one year latter, granted to the Lutherans, but not the Reformed, the status of a "received" or accepted religion. This legalized the formation of a separate ecclesiastical hierarchy for Lutherans in Siebenbürgen, a half-century before Lutherans in royal Hungary received a similar right. The Reformed obtained this status in 1564 and the Unitarians in 1568. This grant of religious choice was not absolute but national-confessional and collective as is demonstrated by the expulsion of Francis David from the Saxon community because of his religious migration from Lutheran, to Reformed, Anti-Trinitarian, and finally Sabbatarian views and of Gaspar Heltai because of his printing of Hungarian works and his Reformed sympathies. In 1583 the Saxon university prepared a compilation and harmonization of their legal codes that governed the Saxon community in Siebenburgen until the mid-19th century.

Discord over Concord in Hungary

The confessional and institutional differentiation of the reform movements in Hungary required a standard formulation of the faith that

[46] *Formula Pii consensus inter pastores ecclesiarum Saxonicarum*. See *Ostmistteleuropas Bekenntnisschriften*, pp. 281–307, and Ludwig Binder, "Die Augsburgische Konfession in der siebenbürgischen evangelischen Kirche," *Zeitschrift für bayrischen Kirchengeschichte* 49 (1980), 54–85.

would maintain the identity and integrity of each group. However, the Lutheran community was torn apart by Philippist, Crypto-Calvinist, Antinomian, Osiandrian, Flacian, and other controversies. To be sure, by 1570 all Lutherans in Hungary recognized the Augsburg Confession as an authoritative explanation of the practices and teachings of the Wittenberg reformers. But which version was authoritative? The collected works of Melanchthon widely used in Hungary contained the *Augustana Variata.* An increasing number of individuals felt that a clearer, normative statement of doctrine was necessary. As in Germany, lay leaders recognized the need for concord since the tacit religious toleration existing during the reign of Maximilian II ended when Rudolf II ascended throne as emperor in Germany and as king in Bohemia and Hungary.

The first attempts to foster concord led to discord. Whose interpretation of Luther's theology was authentic, that of Melanchthon or of the authors of the Formula of Concord. Personal loyalties or animosities, ethnic rivalries, and even tension between secular and ecclesiastical leaders shaped and fueled the debates that establish Lutheran orthodoxy in Hungary. During the 1570s Lutherans in Hungary, already challenged by the Reformed and Anti-Trinitarians, had to respond to the influence of Matthew Flacius Illyricus, the Philippists, and concordists.[47]

In northeastern Hungary Thomas Fröhlich, a Philippist from Spiš assailed the views of Lucas Egri and other Anti-Trinitarians. Later, at a synod in Košice in 1574, Fröhlich presented eight articles that attacked Mento Gogreff as a Flacian. Gogreff accepted the views of Johannes Brenz concerning the ubiquity of the human nature of Christ. Gogreff struck back and accused Fröhlich of Crypto-Calvinism in a tract printed in Bardejov in 1579. This was the first of a dozen polemical works published as part of the intra-Lutheran controversies in Hungary during the 1580s and 1590s.

By then Fröhlich had become a preacher in Banská Bystrica in 1577 and soon after clashed with Gregor Meltzer, a preacher in the same city. Meltzer urged acceptance of the Formula of Concord by the seniorat and promoted the theological formulations of Andreae, Brenz, and Chemnitz. Fröhlich complained that Meltzer was praising the Formula as if there was no greater book on earth. The dispute troubled the

[47] David P. Daniel, "The Acceptance of the Formula of Concord in Slovakia," *ARG* 70 (1979), 260–77.

political leaders of the *montana* cities since episcopal visitors appeared in the region in April 1579. Kremnica and Banská Štiavnica agreed that a synod should consider the Formula of Concord and resolve differences in ceremonies. The sixth synod of the seniorat met in Kremnica in March 1580, attended by 19 clerics, four directors of schools, and 18 lay leaders. It sought to avoid a direct clash with the archbishop of Esztergom. They declined to adopt the Book of Concord since because it contained "new and unusual" terminology in its Christology. All clergy in the seniorat were to subscribe to the *Confessio Montana.* Anyone who formally subscribed to the Book of Concord would be expelled from office. The senior, Matthew Eberhard of Banská Štiavnica, persuaded Meltzer and Fröhlich to sign statements declaring that they accepted the teachings of Luther and Melanchthon and did not substantially disagree in faith and confession.[48]

Following the synod of Kremnica, the dispute between Philippist Lutherans or Crypto-Calvinists and the concordist Lutherans shifted eastward again, to Spiš and Šariš counties. The provost of Spiš, George Bornemissa, warned Valentine Hortensius, the senior of the fraternity of the pastors of the 24 Spiš towns, to avoid any consideration of the Formula of Concord as a doctrinal standard. At a synod of the clergy held in Kežmarok in January 1582, a former Flacian, George Creutzer, accused Hortensius of being a Crypto-Calvinist. The seniorat rallied behind their senior and reiterated their allegiance to the *Confessio Scepusiana* and Melanchthon's writings. Creutzer subsequently published a tract in 1586, in which he suggested questions that would enable even laymen to identify Sacramentarians, Zwinglians, and Calvinists. This tract set the agenda of the debate carried on in print and at a series of synods during the 1590s.[49]

The intra-Lutheran controversies about the influence of Crypto-Calvinism considered questions of sacramental Christology and the utilization of altars, statues, and paintings by Lutherans in public and private worship.[50] The leading Crypto-Calvinists, included Sebastian

[48] Pavol Križko, *Dejiny banskomestkého seniorátu*, pp. 90–99.

[49] Kvačala, *Dejiny reformácie*, pp. 130–33.

[50] The doctrinal formulations of the Formula of Concord discussed most in Hungary were: the *communicatio idiomatum* (the communication of attributes of the divine nature of Christ to his human nature) and the ubiquity of the body of Christ after his resurrection; the *manducatio indignorum* (or the reception of the body and blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper by the unfaithful, but to their condemnation); and the role of altars and liturgical art in worship.

Ambrosius (Lam), John Mylius, Gaspar Pilcz, Matthew Thorkonymus (Kabat), and Thomas Fabricius Tolnai were or had been active in the town of Kežmarok, a town under the control of the Polish Laski family and then the Thököly family. Those advocating the adoption of the Book of Concord included the nobleman, Gregory Horváth Stančič de Gradec, who had founded a school at his castle in Stražky in Spiš, Thomas Faber, Mentho Gogreff, Albert Grawer, Martin Wagner, George Creutzer, Severin Škultéty, and Eliáš Láni. While Ambrosius, Pilcz, and Mylius exchanged polemical tracts with Grawer, Creutzer, Škultety, Faber, and Wagner concerning Christology and the Lord's Supper, Eliáš Láni, Lam, and Tolnai took up the question of the question of whether Christians were free to use of pictures and statues in worship. These intra-Lutheran controversies generated the first wave of Lutheran literature in northeastern Hungary and climaxed at a series of synods that condemned the position of the Crypto-Calvinists: Kežmarok (1595/96), Levoča (1597), Prešov (1597) and Sabinov (1599).[51]

The decline of Crypto-Calvinism did not automatically lead to the acceptance of the Book of Concord in royal Hungary. The German-speaking pastors of the *pentapolitana* and *montana* seniorats only reaffirmed their allegiance to their respective confessions already adopted and Melanchthon's writings. Many were members of the generation that had studied with Philippist teachers at Wittenberg. The most determined and effective defenders of the Formula of Concord and "ubiquitarian" or "concordist" theology had studied at other schools at home or abroad and included the first two significant Slovak theologians, Severinus Škultety and Eliáš Láni, and noblemen such as Gregory Horváth Stančič and the magnate George Thurzo.

The adoption of the Book of Concord as the doctrinal standard for Lutherans in northern Hungary occurred at the beginning of the 17th century. When the clergy of Turiec County established a fraternity in 1602, the articles they adopted to guide its activities included the recognition of the Book of Concord as their doctrinal standard. Two years later a synod in Rožnave likewise adopted the Book of Concord for the Lutheran clergy in Gemer. Finally, after the peace of Vienna and the diet of 1608, the Book of Concord became the doctrinal standard

[51] György Ráth, "A felsomagyarországi kryptokálvinisták hitvitázó irodalmárol," *Irodalomtörténete Közlemények*, 2 (1897), 310–24; György Ráth, "Gradeczi Horváth Gergely és Lám (Ambrosius) Sebestyén Hitvitája," *Irodalomtörténete Közlemények*, 4 (1894), 150–67; György Ráth, "Pilcz Gáspár és ellenfelei," *Magyar Könyvszemle* (1892/3), 28–86.

for clergy in the Lutheran superintendencies or dioceses established at the synod of Žilina in 1610 and Spišské Podhradie in 1614.

The question of clarifying the content of Lutheran theology was addressed also in western Transdanubia. There, after mid-century Lutheranism was established in Sopron when Simon Gerengel became pastor and reform preachers appeared in the towns and villages on the extensive estates two magnates. The "Black Beg," Francis Nádasdy of Sárvár, whose wife, Elizabeth Báthory, later became infamous as the so-called "bloody countess of Čachtica," supported Lutheranism on his estates, especially around Sárvar and Deutschkreutz. Balthasar Batthyány of Güssing was Reformed although his wife remained a Lutheran. When the bishop of Györ ordered the clergy from the region to meet with him in August 1579, both magnates indicated they would defend those pastors who refused to attend. This confirmed their break with the Roman Catholic church.[52]

The subsequent confessional and institutional division of the reform movement into separate and distinct Reformed and Lutheran churches began after the Lutheran superintendent in Transdanubia, Matthias Szegedi, had been succeeded by Stephen Beythe. In 1587 Beythe, pastor in Güssing, presented articles to a synod in Csepreg that would shape the reform movement into a church. Although Beythe, like his patron Balthasar Batthyány, sympathized with Helvetic Reformed theology, his authority as superintendent still extended to the Lutheran clergy on the Batthyány and Nádasdy estates in Transdanubia. However, theological and liturgical differences increased tensions, and Francis Nádasdy summoned a colloquy to meet in Csepreg in June 1591 to formulate a common stance on the question of the Lord's Supper. Beythe represented the Reformed while Severinus Skultéty from Bardejov, returning to Hungary from Graz in the company by Gregor Stančič, represented the Lutherans. The colloquy did not last for several days as planned but concluded when Beythe did not appear for the second day of discussions. Nádasdy then declared that every preacher on his estates was to accept the Augsburg Confession.

Beythe and Nádasdy subsequently attempted to restore unity, but it was too late. Meeting in Meszlen in September 1595, the Lutheran

---

[52] P. Gratian Leser, *Aus der Vergangenheit der Gemeinde Deutschkreutz*, http://www.deutschkreutz.at/chronik.pdf.

clergy adopted and individually signed "Meszlen Formula of Concord". The following year Nádasdy required all clergy on his estates to sign the Meszlen *Concordia*, a tradition that lasted until 1673.[53] In 1597 Beythe called for a synod to meet in Vép, but only Reformed clergy attended. A Lutheran senior of the region, Johann Reczés, convened a separate synod at Hegyfalú and attacked Beythe, who resigned as superintendent and responded with his own attacks on the concordists and his Lutheran opponents. The formation of two separate superintendencies confirmed the confessional separation of the Reformed and Lutherans movements.[54]

In Transylvania Daniel Reipchius was criticized by Philippist clergy for his advocacy of the Formula of Concord early in the 1580s when the Lutherans accepted a compromise statement that maintained the presence of the whole Christ in the Lord's Supper without mentioning the doctrines of ubiquity and the communication of attributes. However, confronted by Anti-Trinitarian and Reformed influences, support for the Formula grew. In 1595, at the last synod held during the superintendency of Lukas Unglerus, the doctrine of the "ubiquity" of Christ's human nature was accepted. Some still held reservations concerning the connection of the doctrine of the communication of attributes with the Lord's Supper. Debate intensified in 1601 when Matthias Schiffbaumer was elected superintendent. Pastors who had studied at orthodox Lutheran universities considered him a Philippist or Crypto-Calvinist. They repudiated Melanchthon's *Augustana Variata* of 1540 and, like Peter Besodner, the city pastor of Sibiu, demanded allegiance to the *Augustana Invariata.* Others viewed the differences between the two versions of the Augsburg Confession as inconsequential. Among them was Simon Paulinus of Sighişoara, who argued the *Augustana Variata* was an improved version of the *Invariata* and called for the recognition of both at a synod in 1614. Besodner, supported by the Saxon national university, persuaded the clergy to adopt a statement that substantially conformed to the Formula of Concord. Paulinus complained to the prince, the Calvinist Bethlen, that the articles were an attempt to replace the *Corpus doctrinae Philippi*,

---

[53] Sándor Payr, *Egyháztörténeti emlékek. A dunántuli ag. hitv. evang. egyházkerület történetéhez* (Sopron, 1910), pp. 42–83.

[54] Imre Gyenge, "Zwei Feudalherren und zwei Konfessionen, Glaubensstreitigkeiten der Lutheraner und Calvinisten Westungarns im 16. Jahrhundert," *Jahrbuch der Gesellschaft für Protestantismus in Österrei*ch 96 (1980), 214–23.

long recognized by Lutherans in Transylvania, and Bethlen blocked the formal adoption of the Book of Concord. However, the doctrinal stance of the Formula of Concord gradually was adopted by the Lutheran Church in Siebenbürgen.[55]

War and Peace

As Lutherans defined theological norms for their faith, a Turkish war again changed the situation in Hungary. Although the Turks and the Habsburgs had agreed, in 1590, to prolong the Peace of Edirne (Adrianople, 1567), a series of clashes on the border of Croatia in 1591 led to war. The so-called "Long War" or "Fifteen Years' War" caused considerable destruction and shifted the border slightly but did not substantially change the balance of power in Hungary.

During the course of the war, however, Rudolf II and Francis Forgách, as bishop of Nitra and then archbishop of Esztergom, took a more aggressive approach against Protestantism in Hungary. They were assisted by a new generation of ambitious lesser nobles, townspeople, and Roman Catholic clerics that had been nurtured at Jesuit schools and by Jesuit preachers. Utilizing the principle of "whoever reigns, his religion," previously declared invalid for Hungary, the king set out re-Catholicize Levoča and Košice. He argued that as royal free cities, they were the property of the king and required to accept his decisions. This clashed with the fundamental privileges of the cities enshrined in their first royal charters and confirmed repeatedly ever since. The matter climaxed in 1604. The bishop of Eger sought a new *cathedra* for the one he fled during the war. The royal commander of Upper Hungary, Barbiano de Belgiojoso, used royal forces to occupy Saint Elizabeth's church in Košice, in Lutheran hands for over half a century, and turned it over to the bishop. He also expelled Lutheran and Reformed clergy from the city and its subject villages. This outraged the cities and the nobles, most of whom were Protestant.[56]

---

[55] Ludwig Binder, "Die Konkordienformel und die evangelisch-lutherische Kirche in Siebenbürgen," in *Bekenntnis zur Wahrheit, Aufsätze über die Konkordienformel*, ed. Jobst Schöne (Erlangen, 1978), pp. 151–60; idem, "Die Augsburgische Konfession in der siebenbürgischen evangelischen Kirche," *Zeitschrift für bayrischen Kirchengeschichte* 49 (1980), 54–83.

[56] Anton Harčar, *Historický význam protireformácie v Košiciach z roku 1604* (Budapest, 1942).

At the diet in 1604, summoned to raise funds for the war, the nobility and cities wanted to discuss the question of noble and town rights, including their ecclesiastical rights before granting funds. Rudolph demanded the funds first and promised he would then received their grievances. Once he got the money, he dismissed the diet. In total disregard of Hungarian constitutional principles, to the 21 articles actually approved by the diet he added, on his own authority, one more. This final article not only revived all previous laws against "heretical" teachings but also forbade the discussion of religious questions at any future diet. Any attempt to raise such questions would be considered an act of treason. This was a succinct statement of the attitudes of the Habsburg towards religious freedom. It infuriated the Protestant magnates and nobles, especially those Lutherans who traditionally had supported the Habsburg cause in Hungary. This and the confiscation of his lands led Stephen Bocskai of Transylvania, a Calvinist who had supported the Habsburgs, to take up arms against them. Supported by many of the magnates, nobles, some of the cities, and the Turks, he occupied most of northern Hungary. Rudolph was compelled to allow negotiations.

The resulting Peace of Vienna of 1606 would not go into effect until after peace was concluded with the Turks and the Hungarian diet confirmed both treaties. On 19 October 1606 Ahmed I accepted the Treaty of Žitava negotiated by Bocskai, who shortly afterwards died in Košice. The territorial status quo was accepted save that Eger and Kanizsa were ceded to the Turks. In exchange for a single indemnity of 200,000 florins the sultan agreed to recognized Rudolph as emperor and as king of Hungary, equal in honor to the sultan. For the next half century the Turks and the Habsburgs were at peace.[57]

The Peace of Vienna (1606) specifically abrogated the final article of 1604, reaffirmed the privileges of the nobles and the cities, and accorded to the Protestant nobles, cities, and towns on the military frontier the right to practice their faith freely, without discrimination or hindrance, save that nothing in the treaty should be interpreted as detrimental to the Roman Catholic Church. Although Bocskay was concerned about the last clause, he agreed to it, just before his death, after Matthias assured

[57] Geza Lencz, *Der Aufstand Bocskay und der Wiener Friede* (Debrecen, 1917); László Nagy, *Bocskai szabadságharc katonai törtnete* (Budapest, 1961); David P. Daniel, "The Fifteen Years' War and the Protestant Response to Hapsburg Absolutism in Hungary," *East Central Europe/L' Europe du Centre*-est 8 (1981), 38–51.

him that any difficulties in the interpretation of this article could be settled by the diet.

Melchior Khlesl, bishop of Vienna, sought to stop the formal acceptance of the treaty by the diet. The papal legate protested granting religious toleration to Protestants. Rudolph II consented to it in August only after preparing a secret abjuration that declared he had signed under duress and therefore his signature was invalid. Rudolph had to relinquish the crown of Hungary to Matthias, his younger brother. However, as a condition for coronation, the diet of 1608[58] demanded that Matthias had to accept articles which recognized the elective principle of royal succession in Hungary. It ratified the two peace treaties and enabled the Protestants to form their own ecclesiastical organizations and elect their own administrators. This legally terminated their subordination to the Roman Catholic hierarchy in Hungary but did not grant them equal status with the Roman Catholic church. The Jesuits were forbidden to own real property. The diet nominated four candidates for the long-vacant office of palatine, two Catholic and two Lutherans. Matthias selected Stephen Illesházi, a Lutheran, who died shortly thereafter and was succeeded by the staunchly Lutheran magnate, George Thurzó.

Matthias and later Habsburg rulers of Hungary considered the acceptance of the law of 1608 a temporary political expedient. They were determined to secure the re-unification and re-Catholicization of the kingdom and to establish royal succession upon hereditary and not election, at almost any price. They attempted to consolidate royal power by restricting or abolishing privileges that enabled nobles or cities to resist or thwart plans of the sovereign. In exchange for their support of re-Catholicization, the Habsburgs expected the Roman Catholic church to contribute to the attainment of these goals. The constitutional validity of the articles of 1608 became the focal point of political disputes and legislative maneuvering for most of the 17th century.

Organizing the Lutheran Church in royal Hungary

In accordance with the provisions of the diet of 1608, the Protestants in royal Hungary established their own ecclesiastical hierarchy. On 10 January 1609 a conference at Bytča concluded the organization of the

[58] Karl Kuzmány, *Urkundenbuch zum Oesterreichisch-evangelischen Kirchenrecht* (Wien, 1856), See pp. 113–14.

Lutherans into separate superintendencies would best be accomplished under the protection of the secular leaders. George Thurzó, as palatine, issued invitations to lay leaders and clergy elected by the seniorats in the ten counties of northern Hungary that were part of the archdiocese of Esztergom, to participate in a synod in Žilina. Thurzó convened the three-day synod on 28 March 1610. He justified its authority by citing the decisions of the diet, and defined its objectives. He declared a separate ecclesiastical organization for the Lutherans was needed and presented an agenda for the deliberations.

The synod retained the existing seniorats but agreed to elect superintendents to perform episcopal functions. It adopted administrative rules and regulations that were drafted prior to the synod by Eliáš Láni, together with Alexander Socovinus, pastor in Prievidza, and the laymen Jaroslav Zmeškal and George Lehotzky. The synod elected three Slovaks as the first superintendents: Eliáš Lani, Samuel Melik, and Izak Abramides, who was not present. The synod also elected three inspectors to assist them: Simon Heuchlin and Paul Lentzius of Štiavnica were to help with German-speaking congregations, and Stephan Kürthy was to care for Lutheran Magyar Lutheran congregations in Bratislava, Nitra, and Bars counties. The elections confirm that Lutherans in western and central northern Hungary were predominantly Slovak. But this made relations with the *Montana* seniorat difficult. The seniorat had not sent official representatives to the synod and for decades thereafter, it questioned and sometimes resisted the authority of the Slovak superintendent.

The synod formulated articles concerning the duties of the superintendents and expected that each superintendency would later expand upon them. The Book of Concord was adopted as the doctrinal standard for the Lutherans in the seniorats. The superintendents were to prepare a new common agenda and a new edition of Luther's Small Catechism in Slovak. Individually the superintendents carried out regular visitations of the parishes under their jurisdiction and collectively sought to promote Lutheran cohesion in royal Hungary. In 1613, the superintendents met and adopted the Wittenberg Agenda as the standard liturgical guide for German churches, while the Bystrica Agenda of 1585, revised in 1595 and again in 1608 was to be the standard liturgical guide for Slovak-speaking congregations.[59]

[59] Ján Petrík, *Chrámove agendy slovenskej evanjelickej a.v. cirkvi* (Liptovský Mikulaš, 1948), pp. 60–62. Idem, *Dejinz slovenských evanjelických a.v. služieb Božích* (Liptovský sväty Mikulaš, 1946), pp. 99–118.

The Lutherans of northeastern Hungary in the diocese of Eger did not immediately follow the lead of Žilina. Only after Christopher Thurzó had converted back to Lutheranism, did a synod convene in January 1614 in Spišské Podhradie with the authorization of the Palatine George Thurzó. The articles adopted by this synod differ little from those from Žilina and were also confirmed by the palatine. The synod created a system of ecclesiastical administration for the Lutherans of northeastern Hungary where German Lutherans were more numerous. Two superintendencies, one for the five royal free cities, headed by Peter Zabler, and one for the churches of Spiš and Šariš counties, under Stephen Xylander were created. Inspectors were also elected to assist the superintendents. The synod likewise adopted the Book of Concord as the doctrinal standard for the two superintendencies. Xylander found it difficult to fulfill his responsibilities fully and effectively due to interference by the Polish authorities in the towns under Polish administration.[60]

The synod of Žilina had named Stephan Kürthy, pastor in Šintava and Sered', inspector for the Magyar Lutheran congregations on the plains north of the Danube. However, they agitated for and soon received from Palatine Thurzó permission to establish their own superintendency. The so-called Mátyusföld or Matušovsky superintency traced its origins to the work two of leading Magyar reformers and printers, the Reformed Gál Huszár and the Lutheran Peter Bornemissa.

Counter Reformation, Conversions, Confiscations, and Rebellion

The Counter-Reformation in Hungary involved three distinct areas of conflict.[61] The first was a legal-legislative struggle concerning religious toleration that concerned the relationship between church and state. Neither the Roman Catholic church nor the Habsburgs were inclined to accept the decisions of the diet of 1608 or the acts of the synods of Žilina or Spišské Podhradie. They sought to abrogate the legal status

[60] Daniel Vesely, "Žilinská a spišskopodhradská synoda," in *Problematika cirkevných dejín, 1517–1681 na Slovensku (v Uhorsku), Badín 1998*, ed. Dušan Čaplovič (Bratislava, 2001), pp. 77–100. Kuzmány, *Urkundenbuch*, pp. 189–99; Juraj Janoška, *O synode žilinskej (K tristoročnej pamiatke)* (Liptovský Mikuláš, 1910).

[61] David P. Daniel, "K problému a interpretácii konfesionalizácie a protireformácie na Slovensku;" in *Evanjelici a evanjelická teológia na Slovensku*, ed. idem (Bratislava, 1999), pp. 55–67.

of the Lutheran church and its administrators. For the next seventy years Catholic jurists, polemicists, and clerics rejected the validity of the articles of 1608 and the constitutive synods of the Lutherans, and non-Catholic jurists, polemicists, and clerics staunchly defended them. Ultimately, political power and military might resolved the dispute.

The second sphere was a struggle between fundamentally different conceptions of the constitutional principles valid in the kingdom. It juxtaposed those wanting a monarchy of estates and those favoring a centralized monarchy. It involved royal, noble, and civic rights and prerogatives, different conceptions of the crown of Hungary, whether it was elective or hereditary, and especially the right of the estates to resist with armed force illegal or "unconstitutional" acts of the sovereign. The struggle took place in the diet but especially on the battlefield during five insurrections during the 17th century (Stephen Bocskai, Gabriel Bethlen, George I. Rákoczi, Emmerich Thökoly, and Francis II. Rákoczi).[62] This struggle not only reflected "domestic" or "internal" struggles but also "foreign policy" issues that developed during the 17th century as the balance of international power shifted.

The third sphere was the religious or theological-ecclesiastical struggle between the Roman Catholic Church and non-Catholic communities. This included attempts to subordinate the institutions and pastoral activity of the Protestants to the supervision of the Catholic hierarchy and clergy in order to weaken the confessional identity and theological integrity of non-Catholic communities in Hungary.

Each of these three spheres of conflict was reflected in the arguments and approaches employed by anti-Reformation forces seeking to transform beliefs and attitudes in Hungarian society. In concert, they shaped the complex approach of the Counter-Reformation in Hungary that included attempts to "cleanse" the country, almost at any price, of religious and political dissidents. Ultimately, however, compromise solutions were accepted under duress and unenthusiastically endured.

Less than three weeks after the synod of Žilina concluded, its decisions were published and distributed with the assistance of Palatine George Thurzó. Francis Forgách, archbishop of Esztergom and a cardinal of the church, bitterly denounced the actions of the Lutherans that began an exchange of polemical pamphlets. On 17 April 1610 he

[62] For the political and military aspects of the insurrections see Vojtech Dangl, *Slovensko vo víre stavovských povstaní* (Bratislava, 1986).

wrote the king that the synod violated the laws of the nation, infringed upon the religious freedoms of individual congregations, and was incompatible with canon law and God's commandments. He called the superintendents elected by the synod dissenters and defamers of the hierarchy of God's church and argued that the actions of the palatine in calling and protecting the synod were a dangerous innovation and established a dubious precedent. He rejected the right of the palatine to convene a synod that discussed religious matters and legislated without the knowledge and approval of the archbishop primate of Hungary. Forgách stated that the Peace of Vienna could not limit in any way the power and prerogatives of the papacy or the Roman Catholic church in Hungary. This argument was used repeatedly by Catholic authorities during the 17th century.[63]

The Counter-Reformation in royal Hungary began in earnest when Forgách called for a synod to assemble in Trnava in 1611. Eight bishops, the papal nuncio, six abbots, and 20 archdeacons and canons attended. No Lutherans heeded his summons. At the synod a former Calvinist, the Jesuit Peter Pazmány, emerged as an impressive advocate of Roman Catholic reform and Counter-Reformation. After receiving a papal dispensation, he succeeded Forgách as archbishop of Esztergom in 1616. Pazmány effectively implemented the Counter-Reformation in royal Hungary for the next 20 years. He sought to abolish abuses, enforced canon law and the decrees of Trent, and delineated the specific duties and obligations of the clergy. Married priests were threatened with excommunication if they did not put away their wives. The distribution of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper in both kinds was specifically forbidden.

The Catholic hierarchy in Hungary retained its extensive privileges; bishops occupied key positions in the royal bureaucracy, in the diet, and as ambassadors of the monarch. The Jesuits, despite being banished in 1608, returned in force. With the Piarists, and the reinvigorated Franciscans, they alleviated the dearth of Roman Catholic clergy and revitalized Catholic education. Counter-Reformation activities focused upon the conversion of leading noble families and urban leaders, and the establishment of Roman Catholic schools. During the second quarter

[63] Daniel Veselý, *Eliáš Láni život a dielo, 1570–1618*. Unpublished dissertation, Slovenská evanjelická boholovecká fakulta Univerzity Komenského (Bratislava, 1995), pp. 30–35.

of the 17th century the majority of magnate and many noble families became Roman Catholics. Pazmány is said to have converted 30 of the leading magnate families in royal Hungary through his persuasive skills and the distribution of honors and property placed at his disposal by the Habsburgs. These *convertiti* employed their rights as landlords and ecclesiastical patrons to confiscate Protestant churches and expel Protestant clergy from their estates.[64]

The death without issue of Matthias, king of Hungary and Bohemia, meant that the "hereditary" claimant of both crowns would be Ferdinand of Styria, who had effectively reestablish Roman Catholic predominance in his duchy. On 26 August 1619, the day that the Bohemians elected the Calvinist Frederick of the Palatinate as their king, Gabriel Bethlen of Transylvania began his first military expedition into Hungary. He was encouraged by George I Rákoczi and Emmerich Thurzó, who forsook his father's more cautious policy. Eventually even the palatine, Sigismund Forgách, and the custodian of the Hungarian crown, Peter Perényi, supported him. While the revolt raged in Bohemia, Gabriel Bethlen concluded a nine-month truce with Ferdinand II in exchange for considerable territorial and political concessions. This enabled Ferdinand to concentrate on his Bohemian problem. Bethlen took this opportunity to convene a diet in Banská Bystrica that elected him king of Hungary. But Bethlen refused the proffered crown. The diet also enacted several articles that defined the legal status of Protestants throughout Hungary. The first article extended to the Lutherans, Reformed, and Catholics the right of the free exercise of their religion; the second enabled the Protestants to name lay "defenders" (*defensores*) for their churches; the third forbade slandering of other confessions; and the fourth affirmed the legality of the synods of Žilina (1610) and Spišská Podhradie (1614).[65]

The three Lutheran superintendents took the opportunity to call a synod to meet in Prievidza in 1620. It considered several issues including selection of the defenders allowed by the diet. The proposed creation of a consistory on the German model and the standardization of the articles of the various seniorats was not well received and provoked much discussion. The superintendents argued a consistory would

[64] Jozef Šimončič, "Peter Pázmaň a rekatolizácia," in *Problematika cirkevných dejín*, pp. 100–124.

[65] Mihály Bucsay, *Protestantismus in Ungarn*, pp. 168–70.

strengthen the church in the face of new challenges. The seniors and seniorats opposed any action that might encroach upon their rights, privileges and customs. The Lutheran churches in northern Hungary rejected a consistory at the very moment when cooperation and consolidation was needed most.[66]

In 1621 Tobiaš Brunczwick from Hlohovec, the court preacher of the palatine, Stanislaus Thurzó, was elected superintendent of the Magyar Lutheran Mátyusföld superintendency north of the Danube. He prepared 20 articles for a synod in Šintava in 1622. that were intended to strengthen the administration of the district and to harmonize the liturgical practices of the congregations in the superintendency with those in the other superintendencies of northern Hungary. But they were not well received. Many clerics sympathized more with the practices of the Reformed counterparts in the same area.[67] Only the intervention of Stanislaus Thurzó reduced open conflict. In 1628, after Thurzó's death, when the superintendent tried to discipline one of the clergy under his jurisdiction who intended to convert to Catholicism, he was imprisoned. Then, two years later, Brunczwick himself converted and was rewarded with a benefice in Hlohovec. After this, the congregations were attached to the Transdanubian superintendency until its demise in 1669.

Hungary became enmeshed in the complexities and changing fortunes of the Thirty Years' War after the Bohemia insurrection was suppressed. Bethlen sought to exploit the conflict to his advantage and wrested from Ferdinand the peace of Mikulov (1622), of Vienna (1624), and of Bratislava (1626). Each reaffirmed the provisions of the diet of 1608 concerning religion while extending Bethlen's lifetime sovereignty over seven Hungarian counties in northeastern Hungary. He proposed to marry Ferdinand's sister and convert. When his offer was rejected, he married Catherine of Brandenburg, thereby becoming the brother-in-law of Gustavus Adolphus. By the time of his death in 1629, however, he had lost considerable support at home for his ambitious anti-Habsburg schemes.[68]

---

[66] Kvačala, *Dejiny reformacie*, pp. 163–64.

[67] Kuzmány, *Urkundenbuch*, pp. 199–231.

[68] Ivan Mrva, "Náboženská otázka v protihabsburských povstaniach," in *Problematika cirkevných dejín*, pp. 125–147, here pp. 130–135.

After Protestantism was outlawed in the kingdom of Bohemia, neo-Utraquists, Lutherans, and members of the Unity of the Brethren sought refuge in Hungary. Among the many exiles who lost family, position, and property were the Lutheran George Tranovský and John Amos Comenius, the last bishop of the *Unitas Fratrum*. The exiles strengthened the ranks, enriched, but also diversified, the Lutheran and Reformed communities in Hungary. Although Lutherans were able to erect their first church buildings in the capital, Bratislava, in 1637, during the late 1630s and early 1640s confiscations of Lutheran and Reformed churches began to take place on a large scale, ordered by magnates that had returned to the Catholic church. They confiscated not only older churches built before the Reformation but also those newly erected by the Lutherans or the Reformed.

By the early 1640s the majority of magnates were Catholics. Ferdinand III's position improved after 1642 with the renewal of the Peace of Žitava with the Turks for another 20 years. The Swedes, who had invaded Bohemia, withdrew because of a war with Denmark. Ferdinand refused to allow the diet to discuss grievances concerning "illegal" confiscations of churches. Hoping for Swedish, French, and Turkish support, George I Rakóczi belatedly attempted to organized an insurrection for God and country, to secure religious and political liberty and a national king. Neither Rakóczi or Ferdinand III could marshal the resources to obtain a decisive victory. Even though the Swedes again invaded Bohemia, Rakóczy sued for peace. On 16 December 1645 the Peace of Linz concluded hostilities between the Transylvanian prince and the Habsburg king. Four main points of the treaty concerned religious questions. The principle of the freedom of religion enunciated in 1608 and repeatedly reaffirmed was approved yet again and now extended further to the serfs. A landlord could not compel a serf to convert to another religion. Where the people requested it, pastors previously expelled from their parishes could return. Finally, churches seized from the Protestants were to be returned to them, thereby establishing the precedent that the use of a church in a community would be determined by the religious affiliation of the community.

Like all the other peace treaties, the Peace of Linz had to be confirmed by the diet. It met in Bratislava from August 1646 to June 1647. Initially the Catholic hierarchy, king, and a majority of the magnates attempted to avoid a discussion of the treaty's ratification. However, the king and some of magnates suddenly changed their tactics and,

exercising considerable political sophistication, urged the diet to confirm the treaty.[69]

Confiscations, Conspiracy, and Limited Toleration

This peace, too, was denounced by the Roman Catholic hierarchy and frequently violated by the nobility. As the Thirty Years' War concluded, the forces of Counter-Reformation changed tactics, modified their arguments, and increasingly relied on force based on the competence of the state to regulate religious matters. They argued that the patronage right was a property and not a religious issue. The right to worship freely did not necessarily mean the right to have a public place of worship. During the 17th century approximately 800 churches in royal Hungary were seized and re-consecrated for Catholic worship. When the "evangelical estates" protested the seizure of their churches and schools and called for their return at the diet in Sopron in 1662, their opponents argued that they had ignored proper legal procedures and had failed to use the judicial system properly. Indeed, as a matter of private law, the question should not be discussed at all in the diet. Further, the Protestants did not merely protest confiscations; they began to counter force with force. Newly installed Catholic clerics were expelled or even killed during the various insurrections. Therefore, the Catholics argued that it was the civil disobedience of the Protestants and not the confiscation of their churches by force that was the real cause of public disturbances.[70]

Ultimately, they were charged treason. In a cruel twist of fate, Protestants in royal Hungary were punished for a conspiracy against Leopold I hatched by Roman Catholics.[71] After winning a victory over the Turks at St. Gotthart and Mogersdorf in 1664, Leopold agreed to a peace that reversed the gains obtained since war resumed in 1663. The treaty

---

[69] Katalin Péter, "The Struggle for Protestant Religious Liberty at the 1646–47 Diet in Hungary," in *Crown, church, and estates: central European politics in the 16th and 17th centuries*, eds. R.J.W. Evans and T.V. Thomas (New York, 1981), pp. 261–68; also available as *A protestáns vallásszabadságért folyó harc az 1646–1647. évi országyűlésen* at http://www.uni-miskolc.hu/~egyhtort/cikkek/pk-protvallszab.htm.

[70] Ivan Mrva, "Náboženská otázka v protihabsburských povstaniach," in *Problematika cirkevných dejín*, pp. 134–36.

[71] Jiří Mikulec, *Leopold I, Život a vláda barokního Habsburka* (Praha, 1997), pp. 98–155.

was negotiated, moreover, by Habsburg court officials, who failed to consult with Hungarian leaders. Outraged, Catholic Hungarian nobles under the leadership of the palatine, Francis Wesselényi, the Croatian ban, Nicholas Zrínyi, and George Lippay, the archbishop of Esztergom, considered offering the crown of Hungary to a French prince. Almost all of the leaders of the plot were Catholic functionaries and nobles, some of whom died before the conspiracy was disclosed. A Lutheran lawyer from Sopron, Stephen Vitténdy, also was implicated in the plot. But Leopold and his Roman Catholic advisors used the so-called Wesselényi conspiracy to justify an all-out attack on Protestants in the kingdom, not because they were Protestant and heretics but because they were rebels and traitors, who actively supported or, at least, did not oppose the conspirators when they began to act.

George Bársony, bishop of Oradea and the Spiš provost, provided justifications for proceedings against Protestants in his polemic *Veritae toti mundo declarata.*[72] He argued that since they were rebels and heretics, the monarch need not keep his promises to them. Arguments used by Khlesl, Forgách, Pazmány, and other Catholic hierarchs throughout the century were restated. The activities, indeed the very existence of Protestant churches, was an affront to the Catholic religion and violated the laws of Hungary. The treaties and laws that granted religious and political rights to Protestants had been adopted without the consent of the Catholic hierarchy and therefore were not valid. The Protestants had adopted new statements faith and religious practices. They no longer adhered to the confessions for which toleration had been granted. By continuing to practice their illegal faith, Protestants become traitors since they endanger public order, the ruler, and the spiritual security of both the king and the inhabitants of the kingdom.

Leopold's response to the conspiracy was calculated, swift, and fearsome. Three leading Roman Catholic magnates involved in the conspiracy were executed. Some 200 other nobles were summoned to Bratislava for trial. Many of the gentry and officials of towns were accused of treason, of sympathizing with the conspiracy, slandering the clergy of the Roman Catholic Church, and denigrating the Virgin Mary. Their property was confiscated, and they were forced into exile.

[72] (Košice, 1671).

A "decade of sorrows" began. During the 1670s[73] Protestant church buildings in royal Hungary were once more confiscated by royal troops. Hundreds of Lutheran and Reformed lay leaders, pastors, and teachers from the whole kingdom were summoned to extraordinary courts. In 1671, the 82-year-old chiliastic friend of Comenius, Nicholas Drabik, was tried and executed for daring to predict the downfall of the Habsburgs. Accused of resisting the closure and confiscation of their churches, 39 leading citizens of Bratislava and 15 pastors were condemned to lose their heads and property by an extraordinary court in Trnava in July 1672. By royal decree they kept their heads but lost their property. The Lutheran school and large church in Bratislava were occupied by force and permanently granted to the Jesuits. Then, in 1673, George Szelepcsényi, archbishop of Esztergom, summoned 32 Lutheran and one Reformed clergymen to Bratislava from the mining cities and the counties of Liptov, Turiec, and Zvolen. Among them were two Lutheran superintendents, Joachim Kalinka of Ilava and Martin Tarnóci from Prievidza. All were accused of crimes against the state and the Catholic church, of inciting revolts, having contacts with foreign countries, idolatry, ridiculing the Roman Catholic clergy, and dishonoring the saints and, above all else, the Virgin Mary, whom Leopold venerated as the *regina Hungariae*, the queen of Hungary.[74] In the spring of 1674 extraordinary courts in Spišské Podhradie and Bratislava essentially decapitated the Lutheran churches in royal Hungary. In Spiš, George Bársony was prosecutor, chief witness, and judge of the 41 clergy summoned before him. In the same month, the later successors of Szelepcsényi as archbishop of Esztergom, Leopold Kollonic, bishop of Wiener Neustadt, and George Széchényi, archbishop of Kalocsa, summoned nearly 700 Protestant pastors from all of Hungary, including the Turkish-occupied areas, to extraordinary courts in Bratislava. Almost all who appeared were from Habsburg Hungary since the Turks did not allow clergy in their lands to heed the summons. They were collectively charged with treason, summarily condemned to death, and the confiscation of their property was ordered. However, if the condemned signed

[73] See the essays in *Rebellion oder Religion? Die Vorträge des internationalen kirchengeschichtlichen Kolloquiums Debrecen 12.2.1976*, eds. Peter F. Barton and Lászlo Makkai (Budapest, 1977).

[74] L. Benczédi, "Historischer Hintergrund der Predigerprozesse in Ungarn in den Jahren 1673–74 (Zusammenhänge der Steuer-und Religionspolitik des Leopoldinischen Absolutismus)," *Acta Historica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 22 (1976), 257–89.

a "reversal" to convert to Roman Catholicism, abdicate one's clerical office, or accept exile and the confiscation of most of one's property, the sentence could be commuted, Of the 336 who appeared, 284 Lutherans and 52 Reformed, 236 signed reversals. Most went into exile in Silesia and Lusatia. A few went underground and worked secretly among the members of their former congregations.[75]

The remainder, 46 Lutherans and 47 Reformed, were imprisoned in six dungeons and regularly tortured. Eventually, two groups were marched to Italy to serve as slaves in Mediterranean galleys. One group ended in Naples where 26 survived and were freed by Admiral Michael de Ruyter after a ransom had been paid; Leopold, under great pressure from abroad, allowed their release if they would not return to Hungary. Only seven of another smaller group of ten that went to Buccara survived. The published accounts of the suffering of the galley slaves aroused considerable sympathy abroad for Protestants in Hungary, especially in England and Holland where Hungarian Puritanism had numerous established contacts.

While the leadership of the Lutheran churches in Habsburg Hungary was forced into exile or to go underground during the 1670s, in Siebenbürgen the Lutheran leadership was more secure. But they suffered too because of the insurrections of the Transylvanian princes, the wars with the Turks, economic decline, and their inclination to favor Habsburg rule.

While Leopold was condemned abroad, threatened by the Turks on Hungary's borders, and challenged by increasingly dissatisfied Magyar nobility at home, Emmerich Thököly from Kežmarok led yet another uprising, which led to the diet of Sopron in 1681. After much wrangling the diet adopted two articles on religion that Leopold I reluctantly accepted. Article 25 reaffirmed the validity of the Peace of Vienna and the pre-coronation articles of 1608. The rights of the landlords were to remain unaffected. The reverses signed were invalidated; the exiled clergy could return to Hungary. Religious ceremonies and services of churches of the Augsburg and Helvetic confessions were not to be disturbed nor were individuals to be forced to participate in ceremonies contrary to their confession. Article 26 granted that churches built by

[75] Pavel Kolárovský, "Niektoré okolnosti a postavy bratislavských súdov," in *Cesty hl'adania, Zborník vedeckých prác k 60. výročiu Evanjelickej bohosloveckej fakulty Univerzity Komenského v Bratislave* (Bratislava, 1994), pp. 91–129; Ján Drobný, *Evanjelickí slovenskí martýri* (Liptovský svätý Mikuláš, 1929).

the evangelicals but which had been seized by the Catholics, were to be returned if "they had not yet been dedicated to Catholic worship". This resulted in a wave of hasty church re-dedications. After prolonged negotiations over the return of confiscated churches, only about seventy buildings were designated that were to be returned to the Protestants. As compensation for churches lost, the diet granted the Lutherans sites where they could build new churches in two places in each of eleven counties in royal Hungary, usually in remote villages, in the free cities, and in several towns of the military frontier. These so-called "articular" churches were to be constructed of wood within one building season, without foundations, or towers. It was expected that if they were built at all, they would stand only for a few years. With this, the Lutheran churches in Hungary obtained a very limited and precarious toleration. But they survived.[76]

Agents of Reform—Schools, Printers, and Lutheran Literature

Among the most effective agents that promoted the Reformation in Hungary were schools, printing presses and religious literature. The number of schools in Hungary more than doubled during the 16th century. Some were transformed, others established by Lutheran town councils and individual noblemen. Of the 160 Lutheran schools in Hungary during the century, approximately 100 were in Habsburg Hungary. Sixteen of the 20 schools in chartered cities were in northern Hungary. Of the 19 noble schools in the kingdom at the end of the 16th century, 15 were located in the north. The Illesházi, Thurzó, Révai, Balassi, Mariássi and Radvan families contributed to the building of new schools in villages, towns or at their residences. Gregor Stančič administered and taught at a school he founded at Stražky in Spiš. Cities provided stipends, and nobles established endowments to enable talented students to continue studies abroad, usually at Lutheran universities in Germany.[77]

This quantitative growth of Lutheran schools was accompanied by an improvement in quality. At the end of the 16th century, 16 city and

[76] Július Adamiš, "Šopronské článký," *Viera a veda* 2 (1931), 221–26; Kuzmaný, *Urkundenbuch*, pp. 124–26; Bucsay, *Der Protestantismus in Ungarn*, pp. 193–200.

[77] Vilmos Frankl, *A hazai és iskolázás a XVI században* (Budapest, 1873); Isván Mészáros, *XVI. szásadi városi iskoláink és a "studia humanitatis"* (Budapest, 1981).

eight noble schools can be considered to have attained the level of a higher Latin school or gymnasium; by 1640, the number had increased to 70. Teachers at the schools, even those in smaller towns, often studied abroad. Some were university graduates, had formal theological training, and served as schoolmasters while waiting for a call to become a pastor. A few like Leonard Stöckel, the *praeceptor Hungariae*, dedicated their lives to teaching.[78]

New curricula and disciplinary regulations were prepared for Lutheran schools in Hungary. Most were based upon the educational principles of Melanchthon, Johann Sturm, or Valentin Trotzendorf. Upon returning to his native Bardejov in 1539 after a decade in Germany, Stöckel prepared new disciplinary regulations, the *Leges Scholae Bartphensis*, based on the school order of Eisleben, where he had taught briefly. In 1566 Matthias Freundt prepared a copy of the Zweibrücken-Neuberg school order for use in Banská Bystrica. John Haunold in Banská Štiavnica in 1587 and by John Mylius from Jihlava in Levoča in 1589 used the Goldberg school order of Trotzendorf and its derivative, the Wroclaw school order of Peter Vincentius, as the model for their school orders.[79] The three-class model recommended by Melanchthon initially was followed. The number of class divisions increased to five and even nine or ten as instruction in Greek, philosophy, and theology were added to the curriculum. In this way, Lutherans sought to provide those students unable to study at a university abroad, with the knowledge and skills equivalent to the first years of university study.[80]

Following the collapse of the *Academia Istropolitana* in Bratislava at the end of the 15th century, there was no *studium generale* or university in Hungary. All confessional groups recognized the need to establish an upper level educational institution, preferably a university. Peter Pazmány, supported by Ferdinand II established a Jesuit *studium generale* in Trnava in 1635. Benedict Kišdi, bishop of Eger, established another in Košice in 1657. The Lutherans also attempted to establish a university in royal Hungary or Transylvania. Gaspar Illesházy wanted a university level school staffed with professors from Germany to open in Trenčin. But it failed to develop due to a lack of money and the opposition

---

[78] Andrej Hajduk, *Leonard Söckel, život a dielo* (Bratislava, 1999).

[79] Peter Vajcik, *Školstvo, študijne a školské poriadky na Slovensku v XIV storočí* (Bratislava, 1955), pp. 59–135.

[80] Vladislav Ružička, *Školstvo na Slovensku v období neskorého feudalizmu* (Bratislava, 1974).

of the king and Catholic hierarchy. Education at the Calvinist upper level schools were enhanced during the first half of the 17th century by the arrival of refugees such as John Henry Alstedt, Louis Philipp Piscator, John Henry Bisterfeld in Alba Iulia or John Amos Comenius in Sárospatak.

As Catholicism revived and the patrons of schools converted, the number and quality of Lutheran gymnasiums declined while smaller schools were confiscated or closed. A few schools, in Bratislava, Banská Bystrica, Kežmarok, and Prešov, were able to survive only with great difficulty. One bright moment occurred in 1667 when Johann Bayer transformed the city school in Prešov into a Lutheran college. By increasing the number of years of study, philosophy, church history, Greek, and Hebrew, as well as dogmatic, polemical, and moral theology could be added to the curriculum. However, it functioned for just three very brief periods between 1667 and 1711 after which it was in Jesuits hands for more than 60 years.

Schools required books, whether in manuscript or printed. As schools began to raise the level of literacy in Hungary, demand for published materials increased. However, laws against religious innovations that prohibited the selling or possession of heretical books contributed to the slow development of printing in Hungary. The conditions in Hungary during the first half of the 16th century and good commercial ties to cities in Germany meant it frequently was less expensive and safer to import publications than to print them in Hungary. Authors in Hungary used printers in Vienna, Cracow, Wittenberg, and Basel to publish their works. The first books printed in Hungarian, Slovenian, and Slovak appeared abroad. The spread of the Reformation and the emergence of Lutheran schools increased the demand for instructional, devotional, liturgical, and polemical literature.

The first permanent printing press in Hungary was established in Transylvania by Johann Honter, who learned the "black art" during journeys through Switzerland and southern Germany. Gaspar Heltai also established a press that specialized in printing works in Hungarian and in other languages. By the end of the 16th century over 800 titles had been printed by 20 publishers in 30 locations, 10 in Transylvania and the *partium*, 10 in northern Hungary, and 10 in Transdanubia. Over 80% of the titles were in Latin or Hungarian and, after 1570, the later outnumbered the former. German titles published in Hungary were relatively rare. Of the 40 that appeared, 30 were produced in Bardejov and in Braşov. Only two books were printed in Slovak in Hungary

during the 16th century, both translations of Luther's catechism. The German Lutherans of royal Hungary continued to publish and acquire most of their publications from abroad. It was the Magyar Lutherans and Reformed who created the greatest demand for domestically printed literature in their own language.[81]

In royal Hungary the most significant printeries were in Bardejov and Levoča. In Hungary north and west of the Danube during the 16th century, 11 printers working in 18 locations are known to have printed 145 titles; of these 42 were printed in the Catholic press in founded by Nicholas Telegdi in 1578. Gallus Huszar bought a portable press in Vienna and published his own sermons and those of Peter Mélius in Ovári and Košice in the 1550s before moving to Komárno, Trnava, Komjatice, and then to Pápa.[82]

Peter Bornemissa was active in western portion of royal Hungary. Like Honter, he had studied abroad and initially worked as a printer alongside Huszár. After becoming a Lutheran cleric in 1564, he served the Balassi family in Zvolen and then, in 1570, was elected senior of Magyar congregations north of the Danube. He served in Hlohovec and Šintava, where he printed humanist poetry but is most noted for printing materials needed for worship by the Magyars in Hungarian; six volumes of sermons, hymnbooks, expositions of the Christian faith, and a very brief, simple liturgy for Sunday worship.[83]

During the late 16th and the 17th centuries about half the books printed had a religious character and reflected the theological controversies and movements in the country. Except for books printed in Trnava, most of the books on religious topics published in northern royal Hungary, Braşov, and Sibiu, were Lutheran in orientation while those printed in Cluj and Debrecen or in southern Transdanubia reflected a Helvetic Reformed stance. While the majority of the religious literature produced throughout Hungary during the 16th century in Hungarian was Reformed, during the first two-thirds of the 17th

---

[81] David P. Daniel, "Publishing the Reformation in Habsburg Hungary," in *Habent sua fata libelli or Books Have Their own Destiny, Essays in honor of Robert V. Schnucker*, eds. Robin B. Barnes et al. (Kirksville, MO, 1998), pp. 47–60.

[82] Gedeon Borsa, "The Book and the beginnings of the Reformation in Hungary," in *The Refomation and the Book*, ed. Jean-Francois Gilmont, ed. and transl. Karin Maag (Aldershot, 1998). Daniel, "Publishing," pp. 47–60.

[83] Tibor Schulek, *Bornemisza Péter. 1535–1584. A XVI. századi magyar művelődés és lelkiség történetéből.* (Sopron, 1939); István Nemeskürty, *Bornemisza Péter. Az ember és az író.* (Budapest, 1959).

century, Lutheran presses produced almost 82% of the total production in northern Hungary.

Catholic printers primarily published polemical and instructional religious works. Lutheran publishers produced, in addition to polemeical works, practical materials, textbooks for use in schools, hymn and prayerbooks for worship, calendars for household management, and occasional sermons and poems to mark important occasions. The language textbooks of Melanchthon and of Comenius were printed in Hungary and widely used.

Especially important publications for both the development of the Reformation and national languages were translations of individual biblical books, and ultimately, the complete Bible into Hungarian and Czech. While there exist fragments of a Hussite translation of the Bible into Hungarian from the 15th century, during the 16th century Hungarian translations of parts of the Bible were prepared by John Sylvester, Stephen Bencédi Székely, Caspar Heltai, Imre Ozorai, and Thomas Félegzházi among others. The Hungarian translation of the complete Bible prepared by Caspar Károlyi and his co-workers and published in 1590 in Vizsolyi became the standard translation for Hungarian Protestants.[84] Although several Czech translations appeared before the 16th century, it was the translation prepared by members of the Unitas Fratrum or Czech Brethren and first published six volumes in Kralice between 1579–1593 that became the standard translation used by Slovak Lutherans. The New Testament was translated into Serbian (1562) and Croatian (1573). During the 17th century hymnbooks, prayer books, and books of devotional materials continued to be popular.[85]

The need for printed materials for public worship, especially for Hungarian and Slovak Lutherans, was great.[86] Copies of manuscript materials, such as the so-called Bystrica Agenda (1585), circulated widely while hymnbooks in languages other than German initially in short supply. Reformed collections of spiritual songs in Hungarian appeared during the 16th century. Published collections of hymns for Slovaks appeared in the 17th century. The *Piesní duchovni*, a collection

---

[84] Bucsay, *Protestantismus in Ungarn*, pp. 154–56.

[85] David P. Daniel, "Evangelische theologische Literatur und Verleger des XVIII. Jahrhunderts in Ober-Ungarn," in *Lesestoffe und kulturelles Niveau des niederen Klerus, Jesuiten und die Nationalen Kulturverhältnisse, Böhmen, Mähren und das Karpatenbecken im XVII. und XVIII. Jahrhundert*, eds. István Monok and Péter Ötvös (Szeged, 2001), pp. 27–35.

[86] Géza Szabó, "The History of the Protestant Liturgy in the Danube Area," *Studia Liturgica* 9 (1973), 186–204.

of 116 hymns of Daniel Pribiš, was published in Levoča in 1634 as an appendix to his Slovak translation of Luther's Small Catechism. But George Tranovsky, exiled from his native Moravia, prepared the hallmark liturgical work of Slovak Lutheranism, a prayer book and a hymnbook, the *Phiala odoramentorum* (*A vial of sweet incense*) and the *Cithara Sanctorum* (*Harp of the Saints*), printed in Levoča by Vavrinec Brewer, in 1635 and 1636. Both used the language of the Czech Bible translation of the *Unitas Fratrum* published in Kralica at the end of the 16th century. The prayer book, divided into twelve sections, was based upon the Lutheran church orders of Braunschweig and Lüneberg. The hymnbook contained 404 numbered hymns; 90 were composed by Tranovský, more than 200 were of Czech origin, about 40 of Slovak origin, eight were translated from the Latin, and about 60 were translations of German hymns by Luther, Paul Eber, Ludwig Helmold, Martin Moller, Philip Nicolai, and others.[87]

During the 16th and early 17th centuries Luther's Small Catechism was issued in most of the languages of the kingdom of Hungary, including German, Hungarian, Croatian, Slovak, and Romanian. While attempts were made to extend the Reformation to the orthodox Romanians by printing reformation treatises in their language[88] it proved even more futile an effort than the attempt to foster the Reformation in Croatia by the publication by Hans Ungnad von Sonnegg in Württemberg of the Bible, catechism, and *postille* or collection of sermons in Croatian.[89] The determined efforts of George Drasković, bishop of Györ, throttled the Reformation in Croatia before it could establish itself.[90]

Polemical literature, academic disputations, poetry, devotional handbooks, and sermons both occasional and collected into postils in Latin or German were popular among the Lutherans in the late 16th and early 17th centuries, but the number of printed works for Slovaks began to appear in greater number after the Czech exile Vokal press was set

[87] Ján P. Ďurović, *Životopis Juraja Tranovského, 1592–1942, K 350. výročiujeho narodenia* (Liptovský sv. Mikuláš, 1942).

[88] Ernst Christoph Suttner, *Beiträge zur Kirchengeschichte der Rumänen* (Munich, 1978), pp. 207–31.

[89] Regina Portner, "Confessionalization and Ethnicity: the Slovenian Reformation and Counter-Reformation in the 16th and 17th Centuries," *ARG* 93 (2002), 239–77.

[90] *Four Hundred Years of the South Slavic Protestant Reformation (1584–1984), Slovene Studies* 6 (1984).

up in Trenčin early in the 17th century.[91] The range of literary forms employed expanded during the 17th century, and reports of the situation in Hungary prepared in Latin or German for foreign consumption were very important. Lutherans imported works such as the *Loci Communes* of Leonhard Hutter used for theological instruction. Puritan and Pietist works also appeared in translation. Latin remained the language of instruction, learned discourse, and politics, supplemented by German, Magyar and the language of the Kralice Bible used by Slovak Lutherans as their literary language to mid-19th century.

Epilogue

The diet of Sopron prevented the annihilation of Lutherans in Habsburg Hungary. It did not end their struggle for survival. The Habsburgs still wanted Hungary unified and Catholic. Two years later, after the second Turkish siege of Vienna failed, the process of their expulsion and the reunification of the kingdom began. Thököly, who had allied with the Turks, fled the kingdom and died in exile. Another wave of anti-Protestant legislation occurred. In 1687 General Antonio Caraffa established an extraordinary court in Prešov and condemned to death 24 Protestants accused of having supported Thököly, enriching himself in the process. Leopold finally intervened and halted the proceedings.[92]

At the diets of 1687 and 1688, held in Bratislava, Leopold indicated that his acceptance of the articles of Sopron was a temporary measure. The diet confirmed the Habsburgs as hereditary rulers of Hungary and repudiated the right of armed resistance as allowed by article 31 of the golden bull of 1222. The Hungarian nobility, predominantly Roman Catholic, supported the Habsburgs in exchange for preferment, property, and prestige.

The explanation of Leopold (1691) imposed new restrictions on the Protestants and made a distinction between the private and public exercise of religion. Protestants were free to practice their religion in

[91] Andrej Hajduk, "Evanjelická literatúra na Slovensku v 16. storočí". *Slovenská Literatúra* 43 (1996), 247–66, 411–46; Ján P. Ďurović, *Evanjelická literatúra do tolerancie* (Liptovský sv. Martin, 1940), pp. 23–180. István Nemeskürthy, "Von den Anfängen bis 1770," in *Handbuch der Ungarischen Literatur*, ed. Tibor Klaniczay (Budapest, 1977), pp. 74–84.

[92] Peter Kónya, *Krvavý súd* (Prešov, 1992).

private, within the family circle. The public exercise of their religion was limited to places listed in the articles of Sopron. Religious practices with a public significance (baptisms, marriages, burials, education), were to be supervised by the Catholic clergy. The "constitutional" right freely to choose one's religion, granted by the diet of 1608 and reaffirmed frequently, had been transformed into a privilege temporarily bestowed. Bureaucratic regulations replaced the use of force and official terror to destroy the reformation movements. They restricted the activities of non-Catholic clergy and limited the civic rights of Protestants. This proved effective as a dramatic decline in the number of Protestants in the kingdom followed. In exchange, the Roman Catholic Church sanctioned the virtual apotheosis of the Austrian Habsburgs in Hungary.

However, the success of the Habsburgs was a two-edged sword. Karl III held that the authority of the sovereign extended to religious questions and was supreme even in religious questions. The Habsburgs subordinated the public exercise of religion to the supervision and authority of the sovereign. They had turned *Unum Sanctum* (1302) of Benedict VIII upside-down. The ecclesiastical sword is to be wielded in defense of and on behalf of the state. Religion was a crucial matter of state, far too important to be left in the hands of the church alone.

COMPARATIVE TABLE OF PLACE NAMES

Key:
(S)lovakia
(H)ungary
(R)umania
(P)oland
(A)ustria

Contemporary	*Country*	*German*	*Hungarian*
Aiud	R	Strassburg	Nagyenyed
Alba Iulia	R	Weissenburg	Gyulafehérvár
Ardeal	R	Siebenbürgen	Erdélyi
Ardud	R	Erdöd	Erdőd
Banská Štiavnica	S	Schemnitz	Selmecbánya
Banská Bystrica	S	Neusohl	Besztercebánya
Bardejov	S	Bartfeld	Bártfa
Biertan	R	Birthälm	Berethalom
Bistriţa	R	Bistritz	Beszterce
Braşov	R	Kronstadt	Brassó
Bratislava	S	Pressburg	Pozsony
Budapest	R	Ofen	Buda
Cluj-Napoca	R	Klausenburg	Kolozsvár
Debrecen	H	Debreczin	Debrecen
Eger	H	Erlau	Eger
Esztergom	H	Gran	Esztergom
Güssing	A	Güssing	Németújvár
Györ	H	Raab	Györ
Kežmarok	S	Käsmark	Késmárk
Košice	S	Kaschau	Kassa
Kremnica	S	Kremnitz	Körmöcbánya
Levoča	S	Leutschau	Lőcse
Mediaş	R	Mediasch	Medgyes
Nové Zámky	S	Neuhäusel	Érsekújvár
Oradea Mare	R	Grosswardein	Nagyvárad
Orăştie	R	Broos	Szászváros
Óar	R		Óvári
Pécs	H	Fünfkirchen	Pécs
Poprad	S	Deutschendorf	Poprád
Prešov	S	Preschau	Eperjes
Sabinov	S	Szeben	Kisszeben
Satu Mare	R	Sathmar	Szatmár

Table (*cont.*)

Contemporary	*Country*	*German*	*Hungarian*
Sibiu	R	Hermannstadt	Nagyszeben
Sighişoara	R	Schässburg	Segesvár
Sopron	H	Ödenburg	Sopron
Spiš	S	Zips	Szepes
Spišská Nová Ves	S	Zipser Neudorf	Igló
Székesfehérvár	H	Stuhlweissenburg	Székesfehérvár
Târgu Mureş	R	Neumarkt	Marosvásárhely
Turda	R	Thorenburg	Torda
Trenčin	S	Trentschin	Trencsény
Trnava	S	Tyrnau	Nagyszombat
Wrocław	P	Breslau	
Zvolen	S	Altsohl	Zólyom
Žilina	S	Sillein	Zsolna
Žitava	S	Zittau	Zsitvatorok
Rad'van nad Dunajom			Dunaradvány

NAMES AND DATES OF THE PEOPLE IN THE LUTHERAN STORY

The following list of names with dates identifies figures discussed in this book plus other prominent Lutherans from the period 1550–1675.

Abramides, Izak (1557–1621)
Aepinus, Johannes (1499–1553)
Agricola, Johannes (ca. 1492–1566)
Agricola, Michael (ca. 1508–1557)
Alber, Erasmus (ca. 1500–1553)
Alesius, Alexander (1500–1565)
Alstedt, Johann Heinrich (1599–1638)
Althusius, Johannes (ca. 1556–1638)
Ambrosius, Sebastian (Lam) (1542/48–1600)
Amsdorf, Nikolaus Von (1483–1565)
Andreae, Jakob (1528–1590)
Andreae, Laurentius (1470–1552)
Angermannus, Abraham (ca. 1540–1607)
Anna of Denmark, electress of Saxony (1532–1585)
Arnisaeus, Henning (1580–1636)
Aquila, Caspar (1488–1560)
Arnold, Gottfried (1666–1714)
Arndt, Johann (1555–1621)
Artomedes, Sebastian (1544–1602)
Aslakson, Cort (1564–1624)
August I, elector of Saxony (1526–1586)
Aurifaber, Johannes (1519–1575)
Autumnus (Herbst), Georg (1529–1598)
Baazius, Johannes (1581–1649)
Bacmeister, Lucas, the elder (1530–1608)
Baier, Johann Wilhelm (1647–1695)
Barsony, George (1626–1678)
Bartholin, Caspar (1585–1629)
Báthory, Anna Jagellonika (1523–1526)
Báthory, Elizabeth (1560–1614)
Báthory, Stephen, voivod of Transylvania (1555–1605)

Bathyány, Balthasar (1543–1590)
Bayer, Johann (1630–1674)
Bebek, Emmerich (d. 1541)
Bechmann, Friedemann (1628–1703)
Bellarmine, Robert (1542–1621)
Berlichingen, Götz von (c. 1480–1562)
Bernhard of Clairvaux (1090–1153)
Besodner, Petrus (fl. 1608–1610)
Besold, Christoph (1577–1638)
Bethlen, Gabriel (1580–1629)
Beythe, Stephen (1532–1612)
Beza, Theodor (1510–1605)
Bidembach, Felix (1574–1612)
Bisterfiels, Johann Heinrich (1605–1655)
Blarer, Ambrosius (1492–1564)
Bocskai, Stephen (1557–1606)
Bodin, Jean (1530–1596)
Boethius, Sebastian (1515–1573)
Bötker, Johann (c. 1490–1564)
Bornemissa, Gregory (d. 1555)
Bornemissa, Peter (1535–1584)
Brenz, Johannes (1499–1570)
Brewer, Vavrinec (1590–1664)
Briessmann, Johann (1488–1549)
Brochmand, Jesper Rasmussen (1585–1652)
Brück, Christian (1516–1567)
Bruning, Heinrich (fl. 1709–1620)
Bucer, Martin (1491–1551)
Bucholzer, Georg (1500–1566)
Bünting, Heinrich (1545–1606)
Bugenhagen, Johannes (1485–1558)
Bugenhagen, Johannes the younger (1524–1592)
Bullinger, Heinrich (1504–1575)
Brunczwick, Tobiaš (1590–1646)
Calixt, Georg (1586–1656)
Calov, Abraham (1612–1686)
Calvin, John (1509–1564)
Camerarius, Johannes (1509–1564)
Canisius, Peter (1521–1592)
Carpsov, Benedict (1595–1666)

Caselius, John (1533–1613)
Cassander, Georg (1513–1566)
Charles V, emperor (1500–1558)
Chemnitz, Martin (1522–1586)
Christian II, king of Denmark (1481–1559)
Christian III, king of Denmark (1503–1559)
Christian IV, king of Denmark (1577–1648)
Christian I, elector of Saxony (1560–1591)
Christian II, elector of Saxony (1583–1611)
Christina, queen of Sweden (1626–1669)
Christoph, duke of Württemberg (1515–1568)
Chytraeus, David (1531–1600)
Coelestin, Georg (1525–1579)
Coelestin, Johann Friedrich (ca. 1523–ca. 1572)
Coelius, Michael (1492–1559)
Comenius, Jan Amos (1502–1670)
Condit, Reinhold (fl. 1638)
Conring, Hermann (1606–1681)
Contzen, Adam (1571–1635)
Cordatus, Conrad (1490–1547)
Corvinus, Anton (1501–1553)
Crell, Paul (1531–1579)
Creutzer, George (d. 1589)
Cruciger, Caspar, the elder (1504–1548)
Cruciger, Caspar, the younger (1525–1597)
Cruciger, Elizabeth (ca. 1500–1535)
Csáki, Michael (1505–1579)
Cubicularius, Ulrich (Kammerknecht) (f. 1538–1565)
Cuno, Mathias (1551–1624)
Curaeus, Joachim (1532–1573)
Danaeus, Lambert (1530–1595)
Dannhauer, Johann Conrad (1603–1666)
Daubmann, Johann (d. 1573)
David, Francis (1510–1579)
Devai, Matthias (d. 1545)
Dieterich, Conrad (1575–1639)
Dietrich, Veit (1506–1549)
Dorothea Susanna, duchess of Saxony (1544–1592)
Dorsch, Johann Georg (1597–1659)
Drabik, Nicholas (1599–1671)

Drágffy, Caspar (1516–1545)
Durie, John (1595–1680)
Dyvbad, Jørgen (d. 1612)
Eber, Paul (1511–1569)
Eberhard, Matthew (d. 1580)
Elisabeth, duchess of Braunschweig-Calenberg-Göttingen (1510–1558)
Erasmus, Desiderius (1466/69–1536)
Erdösi, John Sylvester (1504–1560)
Erik XIV, king of Sweden (1533–1577)
Eriksson, Jørgen (1535–1604)
Ernst, duke of Braunschweig-Lüneburg (1497–1546)
Faber, Thomas (d. 1592)
Fabricius, Andreas (ca. 1520–1577)
Fabricius, Jacob (1593–1654)
Fecht, Petrus Mikaelis (d. 1576)
Ferdinand I, emperor (1503–1564)
Ferdinand II, emperor (1578–1637)
Ferdinand III, emperor (1608–1657)
Fischer, Christoph (1520–c. 1600)
Flacius, Matthias, Illyricus (1520–1575)
Fleming, Klas (c. 1550–1616)
Forgach, Francis (1530–1577)
Forgách, Sigismund (1558–1621)
Forster, Johannes (1496–1558)
Forster, Johannes (1576–1613)
Forster, Valentin (1574–1620)
Foss, Anders (1543–1607)
Frederick II, elector of the Palatinate (1492–1556)
Frederik I, king of Denmark (1471–1533)
Frederik II, king of Denmark (1534–1588)
Frederik III, king of Denmark (1609–1670)
Fröhlich, Thomas (d. 1580)
Gallus, Nikolaus (1516–1570)
Geduldig, Peter (Patiens) (d. 1590)
Georg III, prince of Anhalt (1507–1553)
Georg, margrave of Brandenburg-Ansbach (1484–1543)
Gerhard, Johann (1582–1637)
Gesenius, Justus (1601–1673)
Gestricius, Martin (d. 1585)
Glaser, Peter (1528–1583)

Glassius, Salomo (1593–1656)
Glatz, Matthias (d. 1573)
Gogreff, Mento (fl. 1560–1580)
Gothus, Laurentius Paulinus (1565–1646)
Gottkalksson, Oddur (c. 1593–1683)
Grawer, Albert (1575–1617)
Großgebauer, Theophil (1627–1661)
Grumbach, Argula von (1402–1554)
Grumbach, Wilhelm von (1503–1567)
Grynaeus, Simon (1493–1541)
Gryphius, Andreas (1616–1664)
Gumpelzheimer, Adam (1550–1625)
Gustav I, Vasa, king of Sweden (1496–1560)
Gustavus Adolphus, king of Sweden (1594–1632)
Habermann (Avenarius), Johann (1516–1590)
Haffenreffer, Matthias (1561–1619)
Hammelmann, Herman (1526–1595)
Hanffstangel, Valten (1499–1582)
Hardenberg, Albert (1510–1574)
Hasse, Zacharias (ca. 1480–1531)
Haunold, John (fl. 1585–1594)
Heberle, Hans, III (1597–1672)
Hebler, Matthias (d. 1581)
Heerbrand, Jacob (1521–1600)
Heermann, Johann (1595–1647)
Helding, Michael (1506–1571)
Helgesen, Poul (1485–1534)
Heltai, Caspar (1510–1574)
Hemmingsen, Niels (1513–1600)
Henckel, Johann (1481–1539)
Herman, Nikolaus (1480–1561)
Heshusius, Tilemann (1527–1588)
Heuchlin, Simon (1588–1621)
Heyden, Johannes (fl. 1563–1600)
Hoffmann, Melchior (1500–1543)
Hollaz, David (1648–1713)
Holtheuser, Johann (d. 1598)
Honter, Johann (1498–1540)
Horn, Johann Friedrich (d. c. 1633)
Hortensius, Valentine (d. 1597)

Horváth, John (d. 1564)
Huber, Samuel (1547–1624)
Hügel, Andreas (fl. 1533–1556)
Hülssemann, Johann (1602–1661)
Hütter, Leonhard (1563–1616)
Hunnius, Aegidius (1550–1603)
Hunnius, Nikolaus (1585–1643)
Hunnius, Nikolaus (1585–1643)
Huszár, Gál (d. 1585)
Hutten, Ulrich von (1488–1523)
Hyperius, Andreas (1511–1574)
Illesházi, Stephen (1540–1609)
Irenaeus, Christoph (1522–1595)
Jersin, Jens Dinesen (1587–1634)
Joachim II, elector of Brandenburg (1505–1571)
Johan III, king of Sweden (1537–1592)
Johann Albrecht I, duke of Mecklenburg (1525–1576)
Johann Albrecht II, duke of Mecklenburg (1591–1636)
Johann Friedrich, the Elder, elector of Saxony (1503–1554)
Johann Friedrich, the Middler, duke of Saxony (1529–1595)
Johann Sigismund, elector of Brandenburg (1582–1619)
Johann Wilhelm, duke of Saxony (1530–1571)
Jonas, Justus (1493–1555)
Jónsson, Gisli (c. 1515–1587)
Judex, Matthaeus (1528–64)
Juhász, Peter Horhi Melius (1536–1572)
Juusten, Paavali (1516–1576)
Kalink, Joachim (1602–1678)
Kalmanscehi, Martin (ca. 1500–1557)
Karl IX, king of Sweden (1550–1611)
Karl X, king of Sweden (1622–1660)
Karl XI, king of Sweden (1655–1697)
Karlstadt, Andreas Bodenstein von (1480–1541)
Keckermann, Bartholomäus (1571–1609)
Khlesl, Melchior (1553–1631)
Kirchner, Timotheus (1533–1587)
Kišdi, Benedict (1598–1660)
Knopken, Andreas (1490–1539)
Koch, Cyriacus (Obsopaeius) (fl. 1564–1596)
Kock, Oluf (ca. 1577–ca. 1619)

König, Johann Friedrich (1619–1664)
Koenig, Reinhard (1583–1658)
Körner, Christoph (Corner) (1518–1594)
Kolonič, Leopold (1631–1707)
Komjáthi, Benedict (f. 1527–1556)
Kressling, Johann (1488–1568)
Kromaier, Hieronymus (1610–1670)
Kürthy, Stephan (d. 1613)
Lang, Johannes (1487–1548)
Lani, Eliaš (1575–1618)
Lauterwald, Matthias (1520–1555)
Lehotzky, George (1488–1568)
Leisentritt, Johann (1527–1586)
Lentzius, Paul (f. 1559–1619)
Leopold I, emperor (1640–1705)
Leyser, Polycarp (1552–1610)
Liebenthal, Christian (1596–1647)
Lippay, George (1600–1666)
Lipsius, Justus (1547–1606)
Lobwasser, Ambrosius (1515–1585)
Loescher, Valentin Ernst (1673–1749)
Lohmüller, Johann (f. 1520s–1530s)
Lossius, Lucas (1508–1582)
Louis II Jagellon, king of Hungary (1506–1526)
Ludwig VI, elector of the Palatinate (1539–1583)
Luther, Martin (1483–1546)
Madsen, Poul (1527–1590)
Major, Georg (1502–1574)
Malvenda, Pedro de (c. 1500–1560)
Mancelius, Georg (1593–1654)
Marbach, Johann (1521–1581)
Maria Eleonora of Brandenburg, queen of Sweden (1599–1655)
Marsow, Hermann (d. 1555)
Martini, Cornelius (1568–1621)
Martini, Jacob (1570–1649)
Martini, Olaus (fl. 1585–1617)
Martinuzzi, George (1482–after 1551)
Mary of Habsburg, queen of Hungary (1505–1558)
Mathesius, Johannes (1504–1565)
Matthiae, Johannes (1592–1670)

Matthias II, emperor (1557–1619)
Matthias Corvinus, king of Hungary (1440–1490)
Maximilian II, emperor (1527–1576)
Megander, Valentin (fl. 1557–1590)
Meisner, Balthasar (1587–1626)
Melanchthon, Philipp (1497–1560)
Melik, Samuel (d. 1620)
Melissander, Caspar (Bienemann) (1540–1591)
Meltzer, Gregor (fl. 1555–1584)
Menius, Justus (1499–1558)
Mentzer, Balthasar (1565–1627)
Menzel, Hieronymus (1517–1590)
Michaelis, Peter (1653–1719)
Miszér, Gabriel Pesti (c. 1510–1542/50)
Moeller, George (1529–1558)
Moller, Heinrich (1530–1589)
Moller, Martin (1547–1606)
Moritz, elector of Saxony (1521–1553)
Mörlin, Joachim (1514–71)
Mörlin, Maximilian (1516–1584)
Müller, Heinrich (1631–1675)
Muller (Mylius), Georg (1613–1640)
Multz, Bernhard (1637–1711)
Musäus, Johannes (1613–1681)
Musäus, Simon (1521–1576)
Musculus, Andreas (1514–1581)
Mylius, Georg (1548–1607)
Mylius, Johann (1557–1629)
Nádasdy, Francis (1554–1603)
Nádasdy, Thomas (1498–1562)
Neander, Michael (1525–1595)
Nicolai, Philipp (1566–1608)
Nilsson, Jens (fl. 1590–1597)
Norvegus, Laurentius Nicolai (1538–1622)
Oláh, Nicholaus (1403–1568)
Ozorai, Emmerich (fl. 1610–1630)
Osiander, Andreas (1498–1552)
Osiander, Lucas (1534–1604)
Otter, Jacob (c. 1485–1547)
Otto/Otho, Anton (c. 1505–after 1579)

Oxenstierna, Axel (1583–1654)
Palladius, Peder (1503–1560)
Paracelsus (1493–1541)
Pareus, David (1548–1622)
Paulinus, Simon (1652–1691)
Paurmeister, Tobias (1555–1616)
Pazmány, Peter (1570–1637)
Perényi, Gabriel (1532–1567)
Pérenyi, Péter (1502–1548)
Petri, Laurentius (1499–1573)
Petri, Olaus (1493–1552)
Petrovics, Peter (1480–1557)
Peucer, Caspar (1525–1602)
Pezel, Christoph (1539–1604)
Pfeffinger, Johannes (1493–1573)
Pflug, Julius (1499–1564)
Philip, landgrave of Hesse, (1504–1567)
Pilcz, Gaspar (1525–1606)
Piscator, Ludwig Philipp (fl. first half of 17th century)
Poach, Andreas (1515–1585)
Porta, Conrad (1541–1585)
Possevino, Antonio (1533/34–1611)
Praetorius, Abdias (1524–1573)
Pribiš, Daniel (c. 1580–1646)
Pruckmann, Friedrich (d. 1630)
Pufendorf, Samuel (1632–1694)
Quenstedt, Johann Andreas (1617–1688)
Radašin, Michael (c. 1510–1566)
Rákoczi, František II. (1676–c. 1735)
Rákoczi, George I. (1591–1648)
Rahtmann, Hermann (1585–1628)
Ramser, Matthias (d. ca. 1546)
Ratzebeger, Matthäus (1501–1559)
Reczés, Johann (d. 1599)
Reipcius, Daniel (d. 1612)
Resen, Hans Poulsen (1561–1638)
Rhau, Georg (1488–1548)
Rivander, Zacharias (1553–1594)
Rivius, Johannes (1500–1553)
Rörer, Georg (1402–1557)

Rosenkrantz. Holger (1574–1642)
Rosenthal, Heinrich (fl. 1597–1624)
Rosinus, Bartholomaeus (1520–86)
Rotenbucher, Erasmus (1525–1551)
Rudbeckius, Johannes (1581–1646)
Rudolf II, emperor (1552–1612)
Sachs, Hans (1494–1576)
Salmuth, Heinrich (1522–1576)
Samsonius, Herman (1579–1643)
Sarcerius, Erasmus (1501–1559)
Scheidt, Samuel (1587–1654)
Schein, Johann Hermann (1586–1630)
Scherzer, Johann Adam (1628–1683)
Schiffbaumer, Matthias (1547–1601)
Schleupner, Dominicus (d. 1547)
Schlüsselburg, Conrad (1543–1619)
Schmidt, Sebastian (1617–1696)
Schroeder, Johannes (1572–1621)
Schütz, Christian (1526–1594)
Schütz, Heinrich (1585–1672)
Schwenckfeld, Caspar (1489–1561)
Seckendorff, Veit Ludwig von (1626–1692)
Selnecker, Nicolaus (1530–1592)
Sickingen, Franz von (1481–1523)
Siebenbürger, Simon (fl. ca. 1540)
Skielderup, Jens (c. 1510–1582)
Škulety, Severin (d. 1600)
Skytte, Johan (1577–1645)
Sleidanus, Johannes (1506–1556)
Socovinus, Alexander (1570–1617)
Sorolainen, Ericus Erici (ca. 1546–1625)
Soto, Domingo de (1495–1560)
Sozzini, Fausto (1539–1604)
Spangenberg, Cyriacus (1528–1604)
Spangenberg, Johann (1484–1550)
Spengler, Lazarus (1483–1534)
Speratus, Paul (1494–1551)
Stancarus, Francis (1501–1574)
Stančič de Gradec, Gregory Horváth (1559–1597)
Staupitz, Johannes von (1468–1524)

Stephani, Joachim (1544–1623)
Stephani, Matthias (1576–1646)
Stöckel, Leonhard (1510–1560)
Stössel, Johannes (1524–1576)
Stoltz, Johann (1514–1556)
Stölzlin, Bonifacius (1603–1677)
Strigel, Viktorin (1524–1569)
Stub, Iver (d. 1611)
Suantenius, Enoch (1618–1674)
Sylvester Erdösi John (1504–1552)
Széchényi, George (1598–1695)
Szegedi, Gregor (Gergely) (d. 1566)
Szegedi Kiss, Stephen (1505–1572)
Székely, Stephen Bencedi (d. 1563)
Szelepcsényi, George (1595–1685)
Sztárai, Mihaly (1520–1575)
Sunderreiter, Gregor (d. after 1581)
Svane, Hans (1606–1668)
Tarnóci, Martin (c. 1620–1685)
Tausen, Hans (1494–1561)
Tegetmeyer, Sylvester (d. 1552)
Tetelbach, Johann (1517–98)
Thann, Eberhard von der (1495–1574)
Thököly, Emmerich (1659–1705)
Thorokonymus, Matthew (Kabat) (d. 1586)
Thorlaksson, Gudbrand (ca. 1541–1627)
Thurius, Paul (d. 1574)
Thurzó, Christopher (1563–1614)
Thurzó, Emmerich (1569–1621)
Thúrzo, Francis (1512–1574)
Thurzó, George (1567–1516)
Thurzó, Stanislaus (1576–1625)
Timann, Johannes (ca. 1499–1557)
Tököly, Emmerich (1657–1705)
Tolnai, Thomas Fabricius (d. 1599)
Tranovský, George (1592–1637)
Trotzendorf, Valentin (1490–1556)
Ulrich, duke of Württemberg (1487–1550)
Ungler, Lukas (1529–1600)
Varalyi, Stanslav (d. 1548)

Vardai, Paul (1483–1549)
Vedel, Anders Sørensen (1542–1616)
Vincentius, Peter (1519–1581)
Vögelin, Ernst (1528–1590)
Wagner, Martin (1547–1590)
Wagner, Tobias (1598–1680)
Wagner, Valentine (c. 1510–1557)
Waldner, Wolfgang (fl. 1555–1583)
Walther, Johannes (1527–1578)
Wandel, Hans (1624–1675)
Weigel, Valentin (1533–1588)
Weller, Hieronymus (1499–1572)
Werböczy, Stephen (1460–1541)
Wesenbeck, Matthias (1531–1586)
Wesselényi, Francis (1605–1667)
Westphal, Joachim (1510–1574)
Wiener, Paul (d. 1554)
Wigand, Johannes (1523–1587)
Winsheim, Veit (1501–1570)
Xylander, Stephen (1572–1619)
Zabarella, Giacomo (1533–1589)
Zabler, Peter (c. 1578–1645)
Zápolyai, Isabella Jagellon (1519–1559)
Zápolyai, John, king of Hungary (1487–1540)
Zápolyai, Johann Sigismund (1540–1571)
Zell, Katharina (1497–1562)
Zmeškal, Juraj (d. 1621)
Zrínyi, Nicholas (1538–1566)
Zrínyi, Nicholas (1620–1664)
Zrinyi, Peter (1621–1664)
Zwingli, Ulrich (1484–1531)

INDEX

Abramides, Izak, 489
Adiaphora, 21–22, 24, 32, 34–39, 49, 274, 279, 313, 365
Aepinus, Johannes, 31–32, 36
Agricola, Johann, 19, 28, 39, 43–44, 163–164
Agricola, Michael, 412, 431–432
Ahmed I, sultan of Turkey, 487
Albrecht, duke of Prussia, 54
Alstedt, Johann Heinrich, 502
Altenburg, colloquy of, 28, 43, 61
Altenburger, Bartholomew, 471–472
Althaus, Paul, 325
Althusius, Johannes, 403–404
Alvensleben family, 363, 385
Ambrose, 209, 230
Ambrosius, Sebastian (Lam), 483
Amsdorf, Nikolaus von, 26, 28, 31–32, 34, 36, 40–43, 47–48, 55, 155–156
Andreae, Jakob, 57, 61–63, 82–83, 90, 99–100, 102, 104, 139
Andreae, Laurentius, 430–431
Andrew II, king of Hungary, 462
Angermannus, Abraham, 436, 438, 440
Anna of Denmark, electress of Saxony, 60, 415, 422
Anne of Denmark, queen of England, 426
Anselm, 237
Antinomianism, 43–45
Apology of the Augsburg Confession, 63
Arnisaeus, Henning, 392, 407, 409
Aquila, Caspar, 32
Arason, Jón, 412
Aristotle, Aristotelianism, 51–53, 72–73, 77, 89, 95–96, 100, 131, 138, 201, 361, 364, 371, 374, 388, 392
Arnold, Gottfried, 111–113
Arndt, Johann, 110, 245, 247, 397, 428–429
Artomedes, Sebastian, 261–263, 295
Asklakson, Cort, 424–425
Augsburg Confession, 4, 35, 63, 100, 105–107, 177, 220–221, 226, 379, 389, 392, 406, 418, 420–421, 433, 437–438, 440, 449, 473, 477–478, 481, 484–485
Augsburg Interim, 19–21, 23, 29–33, 35, 37, 40, 54
Augsburg, Religious Peace of, 59, 80–81, 312, 333, 363, 380–381, 384, 392
August I, elector of Saxony, 27–28, 59–62, 81–86, 89–91, 99, 102, 415
Augustine, 147, 237, 371

Baazius, Johannes, 443
Bacmeister, Lucas, the elder, 139
Balassi family, 469, 500
Bapst, Valentin, 212
Bársony, George, 497–498
Bartholin, Caspar, 429
Báthory, Anna Jagellonika, 475
Báthory, Elizabeth, 484
Báthory, Stephen, voivod of Transylvania, 469
Batthyány, Balthasar, 484
Bayer, Johann, 502
Bebek, Emmerich, 460
Bebel, August, 321
Becker, Cornelius, 210, 217
Belgiojoso, Barbiano de, 486
Bellarmine, Robert, 108–109, 391, 395
Benedict VIII, pope, 507
Bergen Book, 62
Berlichingen, Götz von, 332
Bernhard of Clairvaux, 140
Besodner, Petrus , 485
Besold, Christoph, 362, 387–388, 390, 395–398, 404, 406–409
Bethlen, Gabriel, 469, 491, 493–494
Beythe, Stephen, 484–485
Beza, Theodor, 58, 210, 403
Bidembach, Felix, 141, 143
Bismarck, Otto von, 341
Bisterfeld, Johann Heinrich, 502
Blarer, Ambrosius, 21
Bocskai, Stephen, 469, 487, 491
Bodin, Jean, 362, 388, 403–404
Bötker, Johann, 57
Book of Concord, 62–63, 177, 181, 422, 482–483, 486, 489
Bornemissa, George, 482
Bornemissa, Gregory, 478
Bornemissa, Peter, 490, 503

Brahe, Tycho, 424–425, 429
Bremen Consensus, 92
Brenz, Johannes, 21, 55, 57, 162, 179, 198, 222, 422, 479, 481
Brewer, Vavrinec, 505
Briessmann, Johann, 445
Brochmand, Jesper Rasmussen, 105, 109, 425–428
Brück, Christian, 50
Bruning, Heinrich, 399
Bucer, Martin, 21, 56–57, 170, 173, 220
Buchholzer, Georg, 36
Bünting, Heinrich, 145
Bugenhagen, Johannes, 29, 120, 219–220, 401, 414
Bullinger, Heinrich, 57, 475
Burial, 284–286, 292
Brunczwick, Tobiaš, 494

Calixt, Georg, 88–89, 95–96
Calov, Abraham, 11, 93, 97, 101, 106, 109, 112
Calvin, John, 56–57, 170, 222, 448
Camerarius, Johannes, 230
Canisius, Peter, 446
Caraffa, Antonio, 506
Carpsov, Benedict, 390
Caselius, John, 89
Cassander, Georg, 434
Catechisms, catechesis, 125, 130, 143, 159–204, 238–239, 270, 279, 283, 291, 302, 437, see also Luther's catechisms, Heidelberg Catechism, Wittenberg Catechism
Catherine of Brandenburg, 494
Cemetery, 285, 299
Censorship, 85–86, 93, 104, 382
Ceremonies, 34–39, 278–286, 436–439, 473, 499
Chalcedon, council of, 57
Charles V, emperor, 18–21, 31, 377, 379, 403, 414
Chemnitz, Martin, 55, 58–60, 63, 89, 97, 149, 177, 274, 373, 383
Christian II, king of Denmark, 413, 416
Christian III, king of Denmark, 412–414, 416–419
Christian IV, king of Denmark, 423–424, 426–427, 444, 448–449, 451
Christian I, elector of Saxony, 86, 254, 384
Christina, queen of Sweden, 450, 452–453
Christology, 30, 55–61, 107–108, 483
Christoph, duke of Württemberg, 27, 61, 384
Chronick, Hans Svendsen, 429
Church and State, 26–27, 36–39, 81–94, 98, 291–292, 332–335, 350, 361–410, 413–462, 467–470, 477, 486–488, 490–500, 506–507
Church orders, see Kirchenordnungen
Chytraeus, David, 59, 63, 101–102, 139, 188, 198
Cicero, 371, 394
Civil righteousness, 3, 6
Clergy, 345–349
Cloisters, female, 305–310, 318, 352
Coelius, Michael, 245, 253
Comenius, Jan Amos, 495, 498, 502, 504
Communication of attributes, 56–58, 108
Condit, Reinhold, 399
Confessio catholica, 479
Confessio Montana/heptapolitana, 478, 482
Confessio pentapolitana, 477–478
Confessio Scepusiana, 478, 482
Confession and absolution, 282–283, 475
Confession of Csenger, 479
Confessionalization, 2–5, 75, 80, 92–94, 103, 113–115, 268, 286–294, 310–318, 330
Confirmation, 182, 274
Conring, Hermann, 395
Consensus repititus fidei, 92, 109
Consistory, 54, 85, 93, 287, 289–290, 292, 314, 334, 382, 393, 442, 447, 493
Contingency, 28
Contzen, Adam, 210
Convertiti, 470
Cordatus, Conrad, 457
Corvinus, Anton, 29, 36
Coswig, Colloquy of, 61
Court preachers, 92, 126, 398
Cracow, Georg, 60
Cramer, Daniel, 95
Cranmer, Thomas, 170
Creutzer, George, 482–483
Cruciger, Caspar, the elder, 35, 40
Cruciger, Elizabeth, 210
Crypto-Calvinists/Crypto-Philippists, 59–61, 81–82, 176–177, 420–421, 476, 481–483
Csáki, Michael, 461
Cubicularius, Ulrich (Kammerknecht), 477
Cuno, Mathias, 399
Curaeus, Joachim, 60

Dacke, Nils, 431
Daubmann, Johann, 217
David, Francis, 480
Decade of Sorrows, 498
Dersffy family, 469
Devai, Matthias, 459, 474–475, 479
Dieterich, Conrad, 159, 184, 195–202
Dietrich, Veit, 128, 245
Dilthey, Wilhelm, 325
Disputation(s), 17, 83–85, 104–105
Dorothea Susanna, duchess of Saxony, 250
Drabik, Nicholas, 498
Drágffy, Caspar, 475
Draskovič, George, 505
Dresden Consensus, 60–61
Duns Scotus, Joannes, 48
Durkheim, Emile, 329
Durie, John, 441
Dybvad, Jørgen, 424

Eber, Paul, 29, 58–59, 217, 236, 505
Eberhard, Matthew, 482
Edict of Restitution, 381, 405
Education, 270–294, 349–351, see also Schooling, schools
Egri, Lucas, 481
Einarsson, Gissur, 417
Einarsson, Martein, 412
Eisenach, Synod of, 42–44
Elert, Werner, 324–325
Elisabeth, duchess of Braunschweig-Calenberg-Göttingen, 308
Elizabeth I, queen of England, 421
Engels, Friedrich, 320–321
Erasmus, Desiderius, 46, 138, 229
Erdösi, John Sylvester, 459, 504
Ericksson, Jørgen, 422, 426
Erik XIV, king of Sweden, 432, 444
Erikson, Erik, 328
Ernst, duke of Braunschweig-Lüneburg, 308
Ernst, count of Mansfeld, 449
Estates as social grouping, 332–333, 337–340, 369, 392, 402, 409
Excommunication, 286–289, 382
Exorcism, 279–280, 313, 424, 433

Faber, Thomas, 483
Fabricius, Jacob, 399
Family devotion, catechesis, 155–156, 166–168, 183, 196–198, 233–237, 256, 264, 267–268, 276–277, 297, 352
Fecht, Petrus Mikaelis, 434, 436
Félegzházi, Thomas, 504
Ferdinand I, emperor, 19, 21, 368, 378, 459–462, 468, 477
Ferdinand II, emperor, 493–494, 501
Ferdinand III, emperor, 495
Festivals, 129, 271, 277, 297
Fischer/Vischer, Christoph, 156, 178
Flacius, Matthias, Illyricus, 20, 22, 27, 32, 34–39, 41–42, 44–45, 47–55, 61, 63, 144, 222, 288, 296, 381–382, 481
Flacius, Matthias, junior, 95
Fleischer, Michael, 471
Fleming, Klas, 438–439
Förster, Johannes, 96
Forgách, Francis, 486, 491–492, 497
Forgách, Sigismund, 493
Formula of Concord, 30, 45, 50, 53, 62–64, 80, 84, 86–88, 92, 106, 108, 289, 312, 421–422, 425, 438, 440–441, 452, 481–483, 485–486
Forster, Johannes, 35
Forster, Valentin, 399
Foss, Anders, 422
Frankfurt Recess, 27, 48–49, 61
Franz, Wolfgang, 144
Frederick II, elector of the Palatinate, 20–21
Frederick III, elector of the Palatinate, 63
Frederick V, elector of the Palatinate, 448, 493
Frederick III, the Wise, elector of Saxony, 73, 76–77, 79, 90, 95, 131
Frederick William, elector of Brandenburg, 75, 89
Frederik I, king of Denmark, 413
Frederik II, king of Denmark, 414–423, 426, 444
Frederik III, king of Denmark, 451–452
Freedom of conscience, 383–384
Freedom of the will, see Will
Fröhlich, Thomas, 481
Freud, Sigmund, 329
Freundt, Matthias, 501
Funeral sermons, 131–132, 143, 284–285
Funerals, 276, 284–286

Gallus, Nikolaus, 34, 36, 41
Gebhardt, Truchsess von Waldburg, 385, 415
Geduldig, Peter (Patiens), 145

Gender relations, 351–355
Georg III, prince of Anhalt, 21–22
Georg, margrave of Brandenburg-Ansbach, 457
Gerhard, Johann, 11, 97, 109, 128, 144, 149, 226, 247, 378–379, 390–399, 407, 409
Gerhardt, Paul, 12
German *Sonderweg*, 326–327
Gesenius, Justus, 192–194
Gestricius, Martin, 436
Glassius, Salomo, 144, 196
Glatz, Matthias, 472
Gnesio-Lutherans, 28, 33–34, 43–45, 53, 55, 61–62, 81
Good works, 28, 39–43, 121–122, 475
Gogreff, Mento, 481, 483
Gothus, Laurentius Paulinus, 440
Gottskalksson, Oddur, 423
Government, secular, 36–39, 69, 72, 74–77, 80–94, 103, 150–151, 167, 264–266, 275, 291–293, 333–335, 452, 491–492
Grawer, Albert, 483
Gregory XIII, pope, 435
Gresser, Daniel, 35
Großgebauer, Theophil, 154
Grumbach, Argula von, 352
Grumbach, Wilhelm von, 332
Grynaeus, Simon, 457
Gryphius, Andreas, 128
Gumpelzheimer, Adam, 257
Gustav I, Vasa, king of Sweden, 412–413, 430–432, 435, 440–441
Gustavus Adolphus, king of Sweden, 440–445, 447–450

Habermann, Johann (Avenarius), 247–254
Hanffstangel, Valten, 227–228
Hanseatic League, 411, 445
Hardenberg, Albert, 57
Hasse, Zacharias, 445
Haunold, John, 501
Heberle, Hans, III, 154–155
Hebler, Matthias, 480
Heerbrand, Jacob, 97
Heermann, Johann, 128, 149–150
Heidelberg Catechism, 58, 440
Heinz, Wolf, 229
Helding, Michael, 19
Helie (Helgesen), Paulus, 419
Helmold, Ludwig, 505
Heltai, Caspar, 472, 480, 502, 504
Hemmingsen, Niels, 142–143, 419–422, 424, 426
Henckel, Johann, 457
Herman, Nikolaus, 227, 229–230, 235–236, 245
Heshusius, Tilemann, 53, 215
Heuchlin, Simon, 489
Heyden, Johannes, 145
Hirsch, Wolf, 288–289
Hjaltason, Olaf, 417
Hobbes, Thomas, 407
Hoffmann, Melchior, 446
Hollaz, David, 97
Holtheuser, Johann, 264
Honter, Johann, 471–472, 502
Horn, Johann Friedrich, 406–409
Hortensius, Valentine, 482
Horváth, John, 460
Horváth Stančič family, 469
Huber, Samuel, 108
Hügel, Andreas, 49–50
Hütter, Leonhard, 102, 109, 195, 506
Humanism, 66, 72–74, 78, 88–89, 111, 136–137, 175, 419, 437, 456, 459
Hunnius, Aegidius, 138–139, 178, 198, 262–264, 266
Hunnius, Nikolaus, 111
Huszár, Gál, 490, 503
Hutten, Ulrich von, 332
Hymnbooks, 205, 211–212, 216, 221, 233–237, 278, 505
Hymns, 124, 178, 209–219, 226–228, 245
Hyperius, Andreas, 138

Illesházi, Gaspar, 501
Illesházi, Stephen, 488
Illésházy family, 469, 500
Ivan IV, czar of Russia, 444

James I, king of England, 424, 426
Jekel, Jeremias, 472
Jersin, Jens Dinesen, 429
Jesuits, 109, 210, 245, 252–253, 478, 486, 488, 492, 498, 501
Jews, 343–344, 396
Joachim II, elector of Brandenburg, 20–21, 87
Johan III, king of Sweden, 432, 434–439, 452
Johann, margrave of Brandenburg-Küstrin, 20
Johann, elector of Saxony, 131, 375–377, 400

Johann Albrecht II, duke of Mecklenburg, 384
Johann Casimir, duke of Saxony, 394, 409
Johann Friedrich, the Elder, elector of Saxony, 19–20, 24–25, 79, 121, 376–378
Johann Friedrich, the Middler, duke of Saxony, 26–27, 48–49, 53–54
Johann Georg I, elector of Saxony, 98
Johann Sigismund, elector of Brandenburg, 87, 254, 296, 384
Johann Wilhelm, duke of Saxony, 27–28, 54
Jonas, Justus, 170, 375, 401
Jónsson, Gisli, 423
Judex, Matthaeus, 34, 50, 173–174
Juhász, Peter Horhi Melius, 479, 503
Julius, duke of Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel, 61, 88–89
Justification by faith, 23, 31, 34, 39–43, 95, 294, 371, 428–429, 475
Juusten, Paavali, 432

Kalinka, Joachim, 498
Kálmánscehi, Martin, 479
Kalmar, Union of, 411, 413
Karl III, emperor, 507
Karl IX, king of Sweden, 436, 439–442
Karl X, king of Sweden, 453
Karl XI, king of Sweden, 428, 453–454
Karlstadt, Andreas Bodenstein von, 208, 212, 223, 229, 320
Károlyi, Caspar, 504
Katarina Jagellonica, queen of Sweden, 434
Kautsky, Karl, 321
Keckermann, Bartholomäus, 95–96, 138
Khlesl, Melchior, 488, 497
Khmelnytsky Massacres, 344
Kirchenordnungen, 92, 145–147, 182, 219–220, 268–269, 417, 420, 432–434, 436–438, 440, 447
Kirchner, Albert, 472
Kirchner, Timotheus, 63
Kišdi, Benedict,501
Knichen, Andreas, 386
Knopken, Andreas, 445
Knox, John, 403
Koch, Cyriacus (Obsopaeius), 478
Kock, Oluf, 424
König, Johann Friedrich, 97
Koenig, Reinhard, 399
Körner, Christoph (Corner), 62
Kollonic, Leopold, 498
Komjáthi, Benedict, 459, 475
Kostka family, 469
Krell, Nikolaus, 384
Kressling, Johann, 457
Kürthy, Stephan, 489–490

Lang, Johannes, 445
Láni, Eliáš, 483, 489
Laski family, 483
Lauterwald, Matthias, 479
Law and gospel, distinction of, 121, 124, 137–138, 149–150, 152, 163, 241, 267, 301, 371, 409
Lehotzky, George, 489
Leipzig Proposal (Interim), 21, 23–24, 29–30, 35–41, 47, 54–55
Leisentritt, Johann, 228
Lentzius, Paul, 489
Leopold I, emperor, 455, 496, 499, 506
Leyser, Polycarp, 188–189, 254–255
Liebenthal, Christian, 399
Linz, Peace of, 495–496
Lippay, George, 497
Lipsius, Justus, 395
Litany, 244
Liturgy, 208–209, 219–225, 233, 270–271, 278–286, 434–440, 489
Livonian Order, 411
Lobwasser, Ambrosius, 254
Lohmüller, Johann, 445
Lord's Supper, 28–30, 49, 55–61, 107–108, 153, 296, 420–421, 433, 475, 480, 483–485
Lossius, Lucas, 192, 198, 230
Louis II Jagellon, king of Hungary, 457
Ludwig V, landgrave of Hesse-Darmstadt, 87
Ludwig VI, elector of the Palatinate, 63
Luther, Martin, 3–8, 13, 15–17, 23, 26, 28, 30, 35, 39–40, 43, 45–46, 48–50, 52–53, 56, 60, 63, 65, 77–79, 82, 94, 96, 99–102, 118–121, 124, 126, 129, 136–137, 140, 143, 145, 147, 159–177, 179–196, 198–216, 218–224, 226–229, 231–244, 248–249, 253, 255, 257, 261–263, 267, 279, 287, 294, 319, 321, 328, 334, 364–370, 373, 375–377, 382, 392–393, 396, 398, 401–404, 414, 432–433, 445, 456–458, 475, 505
Luther's Catechisms, 63, 125, 159–177, 179–205, 216, 242–243, 249, 257, 262–268, 273–275, 279, 414, 424, 431, 440, 446, 473–474, 489, 503, 505
Luther's Works, 26

Madsen, Poul, 417
Magdeburg *Confession*, 402
Magic, 299–300, 302, 426–428
Magnus, prince of Denmark, 444
Major, Georg, 29, 35, 39–44, 129, 246, 419
Malvenda, Pedro de, 19
Mancelius, Georg, 127–128, 446
Mann, Thomas, 324
Marbach, Johann, 172–173
Maria Eleonora of Brandenburg, queen of Sweden, 441
Mariássi family, 500
Marriage, 280–281, 289–290, 352–355, 372–373
Marsow, Hermann, 445
Martini, Cornelius, 89
Martini, Jacob, 97–98, 109
Martini, Olaus, 440
Martinuzzi, George, 461
Martyrdom, see Persecution
Marx, Karl, Marxism, 320–323, 329
Mary of Habsburg, queen of Hungary, 457–458
Mathesius, Johannes, 125, 132–133, 168, 213, 245–246
Matthiae, Johannes, 443, 452
Matthias II, emperor, 455, 487–488, 493
Matthias Corvinus, king of Hungary, 456
Maulbronn, Colloquy of, 58
Maulbronn Formula, 62
Maximilian I, emperor, 76
Maximilian II, emperor, 461, 481
Megander, Valentin, 478
Mehring, Franz, 321
Meisner, Balthasar, 95–98, 112
Melanchthon, Philipp, 4, 7–8, 15, 21–23, 27–41, 43–49, 55, 57, 59–61, 63, 65, 73–74, 78–79, 83, 95, 99–102, 106, 128, 136–139, 141, 149, 163, 167, 172, 176, 182, 188, 192, 195, 201, 220–221, 226, 230, 246, 287, 361, 364, 371–374, 376, 382, 392, 398, 401, 404, 419–420, 422, 433, 473, 475–476, 481, 483, 485, 501, 504
Melik, Samuel, 489
Melissander, Caspar (Bienemann), 246
Meltzer, Gregor, 481
Menius, Justus, 42–43, 55, 369
Mentzer, Balthasar, 95–96
Menzel, Hieronymus, 293
Meszlen Formula of Concord, 485
Michaelis, Peter, 252
Miszér, Gabriel Pesti, 459
Moeller, George, 460
Mörlin, Hieronymus, 127
Mörlin, Joachim, 44, 49, 55, 60, 127, 172
Moller, Martin, 140, 247, 505
Monner, Basilius, 403
Mordeisen, Ulrich, 379
Moritz, landgrave of Hesse-Cassel, 86
Moritz, elector of Saxony, 19, 21, 30, 33–34, 79, 378–379
Müller, Heinrich, 140
Muller (Mylius), Georg, 255–256
Müntzer, Thomas, 220, 321, 369
Multivolipresence of Christ's human nature, 58
Multz, Bernhard, 399
Musaeus, Simon, 50, 53, 178
Musculus, Andreas, 45, 62, 246–247, 252
Music, 207–209, 212–222
Mylius, Johann, 483, 500

Nádasdy, Francis, 484
Nádasdy, Thomas, 468, 474
Nádasdy family, 469
Natural law, 372–373, 398, 400–401, 407
Neander, Michael, 44
Nicolai, Philip, 505
Nietsche, Friedrich, 316–317
Nilsson, Jens, 422
Nobles, 332–333, 467–470
Norman, Georg, 431
Norvegus, Laurentius Nicolai, 435
Nyáry family, 469

Öttingen, counts of, 387
Oláh, Nicholaus, 459, 477–478
Original sin, 46, 48, 51–54
Ortenburg, counts of, 388
Osiander, Andreas, 21, 29, 54–55, 169–170, 177
Osiander, Lucas, 235
Ott, Johann, 214
Otter, Jacob, 245
Otto/Otho, Anton, 44
Oxenstierna, Axel, 442–443, 452
Ozorai, Emmerich, 459
Ozorai, Imre, 504

Palladius, Peder, 412, 414, 417
Palude, Petrus de, 371
Paracelsus, 110, 429
Pareus, David, 391

Passau, Truce of, 25, 363, 378–379, 381, 388
Pastoral care, 124, 186
Pastoral care, manuals of, 136–144
Paul III, pope, 459
Pauli, Simon, 139
Paulinus, Simon, 485
Paurmeister, Tobias, 403
Pazmány, Peter, 492–493, 497, 501
Peasants War, 322
Perényi, Gabriel, 479
Pérenyi, Péter, 475, 493
Pérenyi family, 469
Persecution, 33, 36, 254–257, 398, 486–488, 490–500
Petri, Laurentius, 430, 432–434
Petri, Olaus, 412, 430–432
Petrovics, Peter, 461
Peucer, Caspar, 59–60, 81
Pezel, Christoph, 59, 81, 176
Pfeffinger, Johannes, 21, 29, 35–36, 38, 47–48
Pflug, Julius, 19
Philip, landgrave of Hesse, 19, 79, 379, 400
Philippists, Philippism, 28, 45, 48, 56, 61, 81, 87, 418–421, 423–424, 437, 440, 476, 481–483, see also Crypto-Calvinists
Pilcz, Gaspar, 483
Piscator, Ludwig Philipp, 502
Pius IV, pope, 478
Plato, 371
Poach, Andreas, 44
Polemic, 109, 152–154, 176–177, 194, 319
Policey-Ordnungen, 287, 291–293, 366, 372–373, 376
Polity, 470–474, 488–490
Poor relief, 341–343
Porta, Conrad, 143
Possevino, Antonio, 436
Postils, 120–121, 126–133, 137, 140, 147, 278, 425
Praetorius, Abdias, 45
Prague, Peace of, 405
Prayer, 242–243, 298
Prayerbooks, 205, 237–254, 278, 505
Predestination, 45–46, 108
Preaching/sermons, 117–157, 177–179, 191, 217, 271–272, 291
Pribiš, Daniel, 505
Pruckmann, Friedrich, 399
Prudentius, 230
Psalter, 241
Pufendorf, Samuel, 406–408
Pyhy, Conrad von, 431

Quenstedt, Johann Andreas, 11, 97, 111, 113

Rabus, Ludwig, 247, 252
Radašin, Michael, 473, 477–478
Radvan family, 500
Radvila family, 447–448
Rákoczi, Francis II., 469, 491
Rákoczi, George I., 469, 491, 493, 495
Rahtmann, Hermann, 110
Ramser, Matthias, 471–472
Reczés, Johann, 485
Red Book, 434–436, 438
Regensburg, Colloquy of, 1601, 105
Reipcius, Daniel, 485
Repentance, 4, 40, 45, 49–50, 134, 175–176
Resen, Hans Poulsen, 423–425, 428–429
Reservatum ecclesiasticum, 380
Resistance to higher secular authorities, 31, 325, 385, 398–405, 439–444
Révai family, 469, 500
Rhau, Georg, 213–214, 230–231
Ritual, 9, 113, 119, 123–124, 278–286, 316, 353, 426, 434–439
Rivander, Zacharias, 156
Rivius, Johannes, 141–142
Röber, Paul, 93
Rörer, Georg, 121
Rosenkrantz. Holger, 428–429
Rosenthal, Heinrich, 404
Rosinus, Bartholomaeus, 174
Rotenbucher, Erasmus, 214
Roth, Lucas, 471–472
Rudbeckius, Johannes, 440, 442, 447, 449
Rudolf II, emperor, 481, 486–488
Ruyter, Michael de, 499

Sachs, Hans, 210–211
Salmuth, Heinrich, 263–265
Saltzer, M., 19
Samsonius, Herman, 447
Sarcerius, Erasmus, 33, 49, 142
Schiffbaumer, Matthias, 485
Schleupner, Dominicus, 169–170, 177
Schlick, Anna, 250
Schlick, Count, 374
Schooling, schools, 162–163, 167–168, 183–186, 188, 190, 192–195, 228–233, 275–276, 307–308, 350–351, 418, 500–503

Scholarship support for theological study, 89–92
Schröder, Johann, 194
Schütz, Christian, 60
Schwenckfeld, Caspar, 110
Scripture, verbal inspiration of, 105–106
Seckendorff, Veit Ludwig von, 111, 406
Sedulius, 209, 230
Selnecker, Nicolaus, 60, 62–63, 177, 236
Sennert, Andreas, 112–113
Sermon helps, 144–145
Sermons, see Preaching
Sickingen, Franz von, 332
Siebenbürger, Simon, 471
Sigismund, king of Poland and Sweden, 437–439, 445
Singing, congregational, 224–226
Singing, school children, 184, 224, 230, 275–276, 298
Skielderup, Jens, 422
Škultéty, Severin, 483–484
Skytte, Johan, 447
Sleidan, Johannes, 402
Smalcald Articles, 63
Smalcald War, 18–19, 25, 32
Social discipline, 121–122, 124, 286–294, 333–337, 443–444
Socovinus, Alexander, 489
Sorolainen, Ericus Erici, 437, 439
Sozzini, Fausto, 109
Spangenberg, Cyriakus, 124–125, 132–133, 155, 177, 217, 263, 265–266, 288, 293–294
Spangenberg, Johann, 132, 171–172, 188, 225
Spengler, Lazarus, 210, 215–216
Speratus, Paul, 210
Sponsors, baptismal, 279
Stancarus, Francis, 479
Stančič de Gradec, Gregory Horváth, 483–484, 500
Staupitz, Johannes von, 397
Stephani, Joachim, 388–390
Stephani, Matthias, 388–390
Stockholm Bloodbath, 413, 430
Stöckel, Leonhard, 473, 477, 479, 501
Stössel, Johannes, 60
Stoltz, Johann, 47–48
Stölzlin, Bonifacius, 179
Strigel, Viktorin, 27, 49–54
Stub, Iver, 424
Sturm, Johann, 229, 501
Suantenius, Enoch, 151
Swabian Concord, 62
Swabian-Saxon Concord, 62
Sylvester, John, see Erdösi, John Sylvester
Synergism, 45–50
Széchényi, George, 498
Szegedi, Gregor (Gergely), 479
Szegedi, Matthias, 484
Székely, Stephen Bencedi, 459, 504
Szelepcsényi, George, 498
Sztárai, Michael, 459, 475
Svane, Hans, 451–452

Table of Christian Callings, 249, 262–268, 276–277, 301
Tarnóci, Martin, 498
Tausen, Hans, 412–413
Tegetmeyer, Sylvester, 445
Telegdi, Nicholas, 503
Tetelbach, Johann, 173
Teutonic Knights, 411
Thirty Years War, 154–155, 405–406, 448–451
Thököly, Emmerich, 455, 469–470, 491, 499
Thölöky family, 483
Thomas Aquinas, 48, 371
Thorkonymus, Matthew (Kabat), 483
Thorlaksson, Gudbrand, 423
Thurius, Paul, 479
Thurzó, Christopher, 490
Thúrzo, Francis, 460
Thurzó, George, 483, 488–491, 493
Thurzó, Stanislaus, 494
Thurzó family, 500
Tilly, Johann von, 449–450
Timann, Johannes, 57
Tolnai, Thomas Fabricius, 483
Tordai, Demeter, 479
Torgau Book, 62
Towns, 459–450, 464–467
Tranovský, George, 495, 505
Trappholder, Lukas, 472
Treatise on the Power and Primacy of the Pope, 63
Trent, Council of, 220, 477, 492
Troeltsch, Ernst, 324–325, 328–329, 367–368
Trotzendorf, Valentin, 501
Turk(s), 133, 152, 244, 343–345, 458–467, 476, 486–487, 496

Ubiquity of Christ's human nature, 58, 108, 485
Ulrich, duke of Württemberg, 381
Ungnad von Sonnegg, Hans, 505

Ungnad/Sonnegg family, 469
University instruction, 65–115, 135–136, 139, 149, 420–421, 447
Ungler, Lukas, 480, 485
Unitas fratrum, 495, 505
Urban life, 338–343

Varalyi, Stanslav, 460
Vardai, Paul, 473
Vedel, Anders Sørensen, 419
Vienna, Peace of, 455, 483, 492, 499
Vincentius, Peter, 501
Vischer, Christoph, see Fischer, Christoph
Visitations, ecclesiastical, 26, 164, 181, 206, 224, 290–292, 312–313, 334–337, 350–351, 416–417, 459, 473, 477–478, 482, 489
Vitténdy, Stephen, 497
Vocations, earthly, 129–130, 183, 301, 322–324, 341, 352, 392
Vögelin, Ernst, 60
Volcmar, Bartholomaeus, 399, 403–404

Wagner, Martin, 483
Wagner, Tobias, 140
Wagner, Valentine, 472
Wallenstein, Albrecht von, 449
Walther, Georg, 175
Walther, Johann, 212, 218, 220, 231
Wandel, Hans, 452
Warszewicki, Stanislaus, 435
Weber, Max, 322–324, 328–329, 341, 343
Wedding sermons, 131–133, 143, 281
Weddings, 281, 292
Weigel, Valentin, 110, 397
Weimar *Book of Confutation*, 27, 48–49, 54
Weimar Disputation, 50–51, 53
Werböczy, Stephen, 457
Wesenbeck, Matthias, 404
Wesselényi, Francis, 469, 497
Westphal, Joachim, 57
Westphalia, Peace of, 405–406
Wiener, Paul, 472
Wigand, Johannes, 34, 44–45, 50, 53, 173
Wild, Johann, 253
Will, freedom/bondage of, 28, 45–53, 108, 422
Winsheim, Veit, 457
Wittenberg Catechism, 59–60, 176
Wittenberg Concord, 56
Wladyslaw, prince of Poland, 439
Wolfgang, duke of Palatinate-Zweibrücken, 21
Worms, Colloquy of, 27
Worms, Edict of, 400–401
Worship, 122–123, 270–271, 417, see also Liturgy
Worship attendance, 154–156, 272–273, 292, 302, 447

Xylander, Stephen, 490

Zabarella, Giacomo, 95–96
Zabler, Peter, 490
Zápolyai, Isabella Jagellon, 461
Zápolyai, John, king of Hungary, 459–461, 469
Zápolyai, John Sigismund, 461–462
Zell, Katharina, 352
Zerbst, Colloquy of, 62
Zmeškal, Juraj, 489
Zrínyi, Nicholas, 497
Zurich Consensus, 56
Zwingli, Ulrich, 30, 56, 208, 229, 375

Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition

Volumes deal with persons, movements, schools and genres in medieval and early modern Christian life, thought and practice. Written by the foremost specialists in the respective fields, they aim to provide full balanced accounts at an advanced level, as well as synthesis of debate and the state of scholarship in 8-15 substantial chapters. Volumes are in English (contributions from continental scholars are translated). 2-3 volumes of 350-600 pages will be published each year. The series is expected to comprise 20-30 volumes.

1. Schabel, C. (ed.). *Theological Quodlibeta in the Middle Ages*. The Thirteenth Century. 2006. ISBN 978 90 04 12333 5
2. Cox, V. & J.O. Ward (eds.). *The Rhetoric of Cicero in Its Medieval and Early Renaissance Commentary Tradition*. 2006. ISBN 978 90 04 13177 4
3. McGuire, B.P. (ed.). *A Companion to Jean Gerson*. 2006. ISBN 978 90 04 15009 6
4. Levy, I.C. (ed.). *A Companion to John Wyclif*. Late Medieval Theologian. 2006. ISBN 978 90 04 15007 2
5. Swanson, R.N. (ed.). *Promissory Notes on the Treasury of Merits*. Indulgences in Late Medieval Europe. 2006. ISBN 978 90 04 15287 8
6. Stayer, J.M. & J.D. Roth (eds.). *A Companion to Anabaptism and Spiritualism, 1521-1700*. 2006. ISBN 978 90 04 15402 5
7. Schabel, C. (ed.). *Theological Quodlibeta in the Middle Ages*. The Fourteenth Century. 2007. ISBN 978 90 04 16288 4
8. Kirby, T. (ed.). *A Companion to Richard Hooker*. With a Foreword by R. Williams. 2008. ISBN 978 90 04 16534 2
9. Rummel, E. (ed.). *Biblical Humanism and Scholasticism in the Age of Erasmus*. 2008. ISBN 978 90 04 14573 3
10. Newton, L.A. (ed.). *Medieval Commentaries on Aristotle's* Categories. 2008. ISBN 978 90 04 16752 0
11. Kolb, R. (ed.). *Lutheran Ecclesiastical Culture, 1550-1675*. 2008. ISBN 978 90 04 16641 7